

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1896.

I.

THEORY OF CULTUS.

BY REV. WM. RUPP, D.D.

THE word *cultus* is used, in theology, in a two-fold sense: first, in the general sense of divine worship, and, secondly, in the sense of theory or doctrine of worship. It is in the latter sense mainly that we propose to treat the subject in this paper.

Cultus comes from *colo*, *colere*, and was originally a term pertaining to agriculture. *Colere* means, literally, to work upon the earth, in a field or garden—to *tend, till, take care of the ground*; then also *to dwell in a place; to inhabit*—since the idea of *cultivating* implies that of *abiding* in a place. Tropically *colere* means to *bestow care* upon something, and is used, first, with a neuter object in the sense of *cherishing, fostering a thing*; secondly, with a personal object, in the sense of *regarding with care, treating with respect, reverencing, worshipping*. From this usage comes the application of the word to the reverence and worship of the Deity, and to the respect paid to objects connected with this worship.

Cultus in the religious sense, then, signifies the system of divine worship, embracing the various acts, both mental and

material, by which the Deity is supposed to be honored and pleased. The word is often used in this sense in classical Latin, as well as in Modern German, and also, though less frequently, in English. "*Philosophia nos primum ad Cultum deorum erudit,*" says Cicero. And the worship of the gods, in the old Latin or Roman sense, as indeed among all primitive peoples, consisted mainly in the performance of sacred rites and ceremonies, such as the repetition of hymns and prayers, the offering of sacrifices, the decorations of temples, altars and images.

Cultus, accordingly, in its primitive sacred signification, is equivalent to *religio*, *religion*, in the original Latin sense of the term. *Religio* is by Cicero derived from *relegere*, to go through again, or repeat something, in reading, speech, thought, or act; and accordingly denotes a repeated performance of acts of reverence and worship. The sentence of Cicero containing this etymology is well known, and reads as follows: "*Qui omnia, quæ ad cultum deorum pertinerent, diligentes retractarant et tamquam relegerent, sunt dicti religiosi ex relegendo, ut elegantes ex elegendo, tamquam a diligendo diligentes, ex intelligendo intelligentes.*" This derivation of the word is now generally accepted, and is unquestionably more in harmony with the primitive religious ideas of the people among whom that word originated than is, for example, the derivation from *religare*, proposed by Lactantius. The idea of a rebinding or reunion of man with God, made necessary by the fact of sin, is a dogmatic Christian idea which could hardly have had anything to do with the formation of the conception of religion among the primitive Romans.

The Greek term most nearly corresponding to the Latin *cultus* and *religio*, is *θρησκεία*, which is of uncertain etymology, but denotes the careful performance of acts or ceremonies in honor of the Deity. This word occurs in James 1: 26-27, and is in Latin translated *religio*, in English *religion*: "If any man seemeth to be *religious*, while he bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his heart, this man's *religion* is vain. Pure *religion* before our God and Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted from the world." The

German rendering here is *Gottesdienst*, *divine service*. But the Greek word for divine service most frequently used in the New Testament is *λατρεία*, from *λατρεύειν*, to *serve*, especially to *serve for hire*. The verb is used a number of times in the New Testament, and is translated by the phrase to *worship*, and sometimes by the phrase to *serve*. The noun is used in Rom. 9: 4 (the *service* of God and the promises), Rom. 12: 1 (reasonable *service*), and Heb. 9: 6 (accomplishing the *service* of God). In these passages we have *Gottesdienst* in German; in the Latin Vulgate we twice have *obsequium*, once *cultura*, and once *officium*; and *cultus* uniformly in the version of Arias Montanus. Another common term denoting the action of divine worship or divine service, in the New Testament, is *leitourgia*, from *leitourgeîn* (compounded of *λέιτος* or *λειτός* from *λαός* *people*, and *εργον*, *work*), denoting the performance of a public work, especially the performance of an office of religion in behalf of the people. From this we get the English word *liturgy*, signifying primarily the service of the Eucharist, but more broadly the fixed parts of Christian worship in general, or those parts which the minister performs, not in the stead of, but in union with the people.

Cultus, then, or as the word is more commonly used in English, *cult*, signifies, in religious phraseology, the ordinances and ceremonies of divine service or worship. Its nature and character in any particular time or place are determined by the prevailing conception of the Deity to whom worship is rendered. Thus we get different cults among different nations, and in the same nation often different cults for different gods. The different gods are not honored by the same ceremonies even in the same country or the same city. The cults of the Romans were different in general from those of the Greeks or Carthaginians; and at Rome the cult of Jupiter differed materially from that of Juno.

Now Christian cultus, in the common or popular sense of the term, is the Christian worship of God, or the worship of God as determined and ruled by the Christian revelation. It embraces all objects, and acts and circumstances which are connected with, or enter into, the Christian worship of God. Cultus as a theolog-

ical discipline, on the other hand, is the theory of Christian worship. The object of this theological discipline is to investigate the nature and principles of Christian worship and to develop the rules for its proper conduct.

This implies that the details of Christian worship do not rest upon any statutory provisions or laws of the Founder of Christianity. In this respect Christianity differs from the worship of Judaism, which immediately preceded it. However it may have been in the earlier periods of the history of Israel, when religion was passing through a process of development, the later worship of Judaism at least was strictly regulated by the legislative code which was believed to have been communicated to Moses from heaven at Mount Sinai. But there is no such code for the regulation of Christian worship contained in the New Testament. The New Testament, for example, gives no directions concerning the location and arrangement of churches, the size and material of altars, the number of sacred days and the manner of observing them, the garments to be worn by the officiating ministers, or the number and length of prayers, and the manner of uttering them. This absence of directions in regard to matters concerning which so much care is taken in the sacred books of other religions, is not because these matters are absolutely without importance or interest, but because they regulate themselves in accordance with the law of life immanent in the Christian religion.

Christian worship is a vital product of the religious instinct of the Church, not the result of a system of rules laid down in the Christian Scriptures. The instinct of worship is universal in human nature. Christianity does not create this instinct. It merely purifies, quickens and directs it, according to the law of the Spirit of Christ. There is a law of divine worship immanent in the spirit and life of Christianity; but this law is a living ideal, not a formal commandment. The only commandment concerning matters of cultus contained in the New Testament is the commandment concerning the observance of the two sacraments; and even this relates only to the bare fact, and not at all to the manner of their administration; so that it is possible, for in-

stance, for controversies to exist concerning the mode of baptism. The Christian ideal of worship possesses, indeed, a spontaneous energy, pressing for its own realization; but, like all moral ideals, it can realize itself only through human intelligence and volition. A Christian will worship God in a Christian way only in so far as he has apprehended the Christian ideal and resolved to realize it in his own devotions. Hence we perceive the propriety and necessity of the study of the theory of cultus on the part of the Church, and especially on the part of her ministers. The object of this study is to gain a clear conception of the principles of Christian worship, with a view to their application in the conduct of worship. Such study is particularly important in a reflective and critical age like the present. In other, less reflective and more spontaneous and creative periods of history the spirit of worship might, in consequence of its own internal energy, find expression for itself in appropriate forms without any theory or rule. In fact, practice always goes before theory. Poetry was written before there was any science or theory of poetry; but in time there arose the necessity of a theory; and now the practice of the art of poetry must conform with the principles of the theory. So it is also with worship. The Christian Church, in the early vigor of her fresh life, worshipped God and projected systems of worship without the aid of any self-conscious theory; but in subsequent times, when differences of practice awakened reflection, and when questions and controversies arose concerning matters of worship, study and theory became a necessity; and that necessity certainly has not yet passed away.

Let us now glance for a moment at the history of cultus as a science. Probably the earliest description of Christian worship, outside of the New Testament, that has come down to us is contained in a letter of Pliny the younger to the Emperor Trajan, written about A. D. 111. According to the representation of this letter, which embodied the results of legal investigations, the Christians assembled at sunrise, on an appointed day, and sang responsively a hymn to Christ as God, and then pledged themselves not to commit any sort of wickedness. Afterwards,

at evening, they assembled again to eat common and innocent food. The last statement probably refers to the celebration of the Lord's Supper along with the accompanying love feast. The "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," dating from about A. D. 120, contains directions for the celebration of the Eucharist, in which the prayers are prescribed which are to be used in connection with this celebration. But the first descriptive account of Christian worship, for the benefit of persons not members of the Church, is contained in chapter 67 of Justin Martyr's first Apology, written about A. D. 150, and addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius. Justin describes the worship of the Christians on the Lord's Day as consisting in the reading of Scripture, a free address, hortatory and doctrinal, by the president of the meeting, the presentation of bread and wine, prayers and thanksgivings offered by the president "according to his ability," to which the people responded with an *Amen*, the distribution of the elements of the sacrament among those present, and the contribution of alms.

Of merely descriptive accounts of Christian cultus, furnished in the interest of ministers of religion, we have an example in the eighth book of the Apostolical Constitutions. Here the various parts of Christian worship are fully described for the instruction and direction of those who are to perform them, of course without any discussions of principles. The forms here described constitute what has usually been called the Clementine liturgy, which is believed to have been in use, substantially as here given, in portions of the Syrian Church, during the latter part of the Ante-Nicene age. Works of a similar character are abundant both in the Catholic and Protestant Churches. The Greek and Latin liturgies and the various Protestant *agenda* are examples.

Of a more scientific method of treating the subject of cultus but few traces appear before the time of the Reformation. Cyrill, of Jerusalem, furnished something in this way in a work called *Mystagogic Catechism*. So also did Dionysius, the Areopagite, in a work entitled *Hierarchia Cœlistis*, in which the acts of

Christian worship are represented ideally as reflections of the order and service of heaven. Works of a similar character appeared also in the Catholic Church during the Middle Ages. In Protestantism works of this class are rare, because there is little in Protestant worship that needs symbolical explanation.

Beginnings of a really scientific treatment of the subject of cultus we meet first in the age of the Reformation, when it became necessary to give a reason for the modifications which were undertaken in the sphere of worship. The Reformers assumed an attitude of entire freedom in relation to the worship as well as in relation to the theology of the Catholic Church. They abolished some things in the old order of worship; they changed some things, and they introduced some new things. For this procedure it was incumbent upon them to discover the necessary reasons, or principles, by which it could be justified to the Christian consciousness. Efforts in this direction were made by Luther in a tract concerning the *Order of Divine service*, 1523, in the *German Mass*, 1526, and in various letters; also by Zwingli in his *Epichiresis de Canone Missæ*, and in several other writings. Material relating to the theory of worship is found also in the confessional writings of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches, especially in the articles relating to ceremonies, preaching and the mass. The questions in controversy between the Reformers and their opponents involved so many matters connected with cultus that the writings of the Reformers must necessarily contain much material bearing upon the theory of cultus.

But it was natural that in the time of the Reformation consideration should be given mainly to immediately practical needs. Reflection concerning liturgical matters did not rise to the level of strictly scientific and systematic thinking. Sound Christian feeling, attaching itself to what was believed to be the teaching of Scripture in regard to these matters, led directly to practical conclusions, while the profounder theological thought in the Protestant Churches was concerned mainly with dogmatic and philosophical questions. At a later period Pietism, which checked

the interest in dogmatic and speculative theology, and gave an impulse to the practical disciplines, failed to pay much attention to liturgical questions, because of its generally subjective and un-Churchly character. In the Churches of Puritan origin, and in those controlled by the spirit of Methodism, scarcely any attention is paid to the science of cultus, for the reason that in these Churches there are but few fixed forms of worship. The prayers here are all extemporaneous effusions, and are inspired merely by the varying moods of the minister or by accidental circumstances. The reading of Scripture lessons, the selection of hymns and music, the matter and form of prayers, as well as the selection of texts and themes for sermons—all this is left to caprice or accident. As the sermon is the principal thing in the actual conduct of worship, all scientific interest is concentrated in homiletics; and this, as generally treated, is merely a collection of rules for the construction of sermons, governed, not by any principles of cultus, but merely by the common principles of rhetoric.

In the German Churches of Continental Europe more attention was paid to the theory of cultus during the period of German rationalism. It was felt that the old forms of worship, the old formularies of prayer, of confession, of praise, and so forth, were not in harmony with the spirit of illuminism which found expression in the sermons and doctrinal treatises of the period. This circumstance necessarily led to reflection on the theory of cultus; and works began to be written on the subject, and lectures delivered in the universities. But it was especially Schleiermacher, the restorer of faith, and the father of the new German theology, who awakened interest in the science of cultus. Schleiermacher vindicated a more unhonorable position for practical theology in general than that which it had hitherto occupied in the circle of theological disciplines. It was he who raised practical theology to the dignity of a science, which he called the crown of all theological studies. Concerning Christian worship, especially Schleiermacher gave expression to a number of fruitful ideas, which have since been taken up and developed by a

larger number of able writers on the subject. Among these may be mentioned the names of Nitsch, Palmer, Hagenbach, Schweitzer and Ebrard, the last three belonging specifically to the Reformed Church.*

After this brief historical review we proceed now to the study of the theory of cultus itself. The main question with which we have to do here is: What is the true conception of Christian worship? And the meaning of this question is not, what is the nature and effect of prayer in general. Does God hear and answer prayer? That is a dogmatic question, the answer to which must be assumed in a discussion of the theory of cultus. All prayer is intercourse or communion of the soul with God, in which God Himself must be supposed to have an active part. But cultus is more than prayer. And dogmatic discussion of the nature and efficacy of prayer would not be a theory of Christian cultus as an organic function of the Church. The question here is: What is the nature and purpose of Christian worship as exercised by the Church in its collective and organic capacity? And to this question the study of cultus has developed different answers, which have taken the form of more or less consistent theories.

We have, first, the so-called *sacrificial* theory, that is, the theory that Christian worship is an offering or service rendered to God in the literal sense of the term, for which God is bound to pay something in return. This theory is favored by the term *divine service*, by which worship is commonly designated. Service, unless it be that of a slave, presupposes wages; and even in the case of a slave the performance of service presupposes the duty of maintenance on the part of the master. The Greek word for service, *λατρεία*, comes from the root *λάτρω*, which means *pay, hire*. And a sacrifice, in the usual sense of the term is the surrender of something to God with the view of so pleasing Him

* On the history of cultus see Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, Books XIV. and XV.; and compare Herzog's *Real Encyclopedia*, first ed., Vol. V., Art. *Gottesdienst*; Ebrard's *Vorlesungen über Praktische Theologie*, p. 238 sq.; Hoin's *Liturgies*, p. 137 sq.; and *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. XIV., Art. *Liturggy*.

as to get something from Him in return. In this sacrificial theory, then, worship is regarded as a good work, a performance that is well pleasing to God, because it contributes somehow to His glory or honor; and consequently as establishing a claim to reward. God is bound to reward that which is undertaken in the interest of His honor or for His satisfaction. Worship thus acquires something of a mercenary character. This conclusion may be softened somewhat by subtle distinctions and spiritualizing explanations, by which the theory may be to some extent vindicated against the obvious objections to which it is liable, but can not be made to commend itself to the most delicate Christian consciousness.

This is the theory which prevails in the Roman Catholic Church and dominates its cultus. The common practice of the Roman Catholic Church clearly involves the idea that worship is a work, a service, which God is in justice bound to reward. The supposed operation of the sacrifice of the mass as laying God under obligation to grant certain favors to the living and the dead, the indulgence promised as a reward for visiting certain churches or sacred places at certain seasons, or for saying a certain number of prayers—Ave Marias and Pater Nosters—or for contributing a certain amount of alms; these conceptions are all illustrations of this theory. This theory, moreover, is the view of worship that usually prevails in heathenism, if not as a self-conscious theory, at least as a spontaneous sentiment. The worship of the gods, by means of sacrifices, hymns, prayers and similar performances, among the Greeks and Romans, as we learn from classic literature, had its controlling motive in this conception. The *θρησκεία τῶν θεῶν* of the Greeks and the *cultus deorum* of the Romans were usually undertaken for the purpose either of putting the gods under obligation, or of cajoling them into a willingness, to grant desired favors. The same conception also lay originally at the foundation of the cultus of the Hebrews, as we may still learn from the sacrificial terminology of the Old Testament. Jacob's vow at Bethel, for instance, as we have it reported by the Jehovist, has a decidedly mercenary tone. He

promises to serve Jehovah if Jehovah will do certain things for him.

The theory of cultus which we shall consider next may be called the *pedagogic* or *educational* theory. The leading idea of this theory is that worship is not a service rendered to God, but a service rendered to man. It is, therefore, the direct opposite of the preceding theory. The notion that to go to church, to listen to sermons, to join in the repetition of creeds and prayers and hymns, or to join in the celebration of sacraments, is a good work, laying God under obligation to the worshipper, is here declared to be superstition; as is also the notion that the performance of certain acts of cultus in and of itself produces certain moral and spiritual effects, in like manner as the operations of the agriculturist produces certain effects among the plants which he cultivates. Not God, but himself, does a man serve when he goes to church and allows himself to be instructed, and admonished, and made better; and this improvement is not the result of any divine agency in cultus, but merely of the reflex influences proceeding from prayers and hymns and other spiritual exercises. This educational theory lends itself readily to a naturalistic method of thought, and was the favorite theory in Germany during the reign of the vulgar rationalism. According to this view the various parts of cultus, prayer, confession, song, sermon, sacrament, have value only in so far as they can be made subservient to purposes of education or edification. Where this theory prevails, the sermon will be the prevailing element in cultus, and prayers and hymns will either have a dry and intellectual or else a merely sentimental tone.

It has been maintained, by Ebrard, for example, in an "Essay on Liturgies from the Standpoint of the Reformed Church," 1843, that this pedagogic theory is essentially the theory of the Reformed Church. According to Ebrard, in this essay, the object of cultus is nothing else than the continuous study of the Bible, the objective record of redemption, as the condition of the genesis and confirmation of Christian faith in the individual members of the Church; and this he claims to be the Re-

formed view of cultus. It should be added, however, that in his lectures on practical theology, of the year 1854, Ebrard no longer adheres to this view. He still rejects the theory of a combination of sacrificial and sacramental elements in cultus, which was advocated by Kliefoth and others; and there are passages in this work which seem to be echoes of the author's earlier educational theory, but the ruling principle of the work is much more profound and demands a more comprehensive theory. Others, like Schneckenburger, maintain that the proper theory of the Reformed Church is the sacrificial. Schneckenburger says that, according to the Reformed conception, "all divine worship is a common act of the congregation which therein offers and presents itself unto the Lord; and that the predominant element in this act of the congregation is *adoration*, which is regarded as a service due from man to God, and demanded by the first table of the Decalogue." * On these representations we can only remark in passing that, while the legalistic tinge which belongs to the cultus of the Reformed Church in some countries, like Holland and Scotland, seems to speak in favor of Schneckenburger's view, and while certain rationalistic practices in Germany and elsewhere might be interpreted in favor of the view of Ebrard, yet neither of these views belongs exclusively to the Reformed Church, and she is not bound to maintain either of them. In our opinion it implies an exceedingly poor conception of the Reformed Church to suppose that she must stand or fall with any set of doctrines or practices that may have been maintained at any particular time or place in the past. The Reformed Church, as a *living* and not a *dead* Church, is capable of adjusting herself to new truths and new conditions presented by the thought and life of a new age; and they are but doubtful friends of the Reformed Church who suppose otherwise. The Reformed Church is not a petrified sect swearing to the theological crotchets of a dead past.

We have, thirdly, to consider what has been called the *sacramental theory* of cultus, which is represented by Palmer and others as the original theory of the Lutheran Church. This the-

* See Herzog's Real Enc., first ed., Vol. V., p. 269.

ory emphasizes the fact that in cultus there is a divine factor or agency, exercised especially through the administration of the sacraments and the preaching of the word, and looking to the cultivation of the spiritual or Christian life in man. While the sacrificial theory represents cultus prevailing as a human activity having God for its object, and while the pedagogic theory represents it mainly as a human activity having man himself for its object, the sacramental theory represents it as a divine activity terminating upon man. In the sacrificial theory the word cultus may be said to be used in the metaphorical classical sense, as applied to the worship or care of the gods; while in the sacramental theory it is used rather in its original or literal sense, as applied to the cultivation of plants. What the agriculturist does, by means of his labor and fertilizers, to the plants or grains under his care, that God does, by means of His word and sacraments administered through human agency, to men in His Church, cultivating and training them with a view to the realization of their ultimate destiny in His eternal kingdom; and, this, then is divine or Christian cultus.

This view may appeal, as a proof of its correctness to St. Paul's expression (I. Cor. 3: 9), "Ye are God's husbandry," *θεοῦ γεώργιον*, which the Vulgate translates *dei agricultura*. There is undoubtedly an objective divine element or agency in the Church, which acts upon men for spiritual purposes somewhat as the elements of nature—air, light, heat, moisture—act upon the growing grain. As a doctrine of cultus, however, the sacramental theory is one-sided and defective. It makes cultus merely a part of the order of salvation—a means of justification, of conversion and sanctification. That the word and sacraments enter into cultus as a means to the genesis and growth of the Christian life is, of course, true; but this does not exhaust their meaning in cultus; else the doctrine of cultus would be merely a section of dogmatics. And, besides, cultus embraces other elements in addition to the word and sacraments which receive no proper recognition in this theory.

The last partial theory of cultus which we shall mention may be called the *poetical* or *æsthetic*. It was the theory of Schleier-

macher, and is advocated by Palmer and other German writers on practical theology. It regards Christian cultus or worship exclusively in the nature of a solemn celebration of God and divine things, which has its end in itself. Worship is thus allied to art. It is not only artistic in *form*; but it is also like art in having for its end the self-satisfaction or enjoyment of the worshipping subject, namely, the religious mind of the Church. As nature involves not only impulses to action, but also tendencies to enjoyment and rest; so the religious life tends to manifest itself not merely in ethical action and work, but also in æsthetic contemplation and celebration of its own contents, in which celebration there must be for the religious spirit the highest gratification and pleasure.

There is doubtless an important element of truth in this theory, as there is in each of the others which we have mentioned. Worship is the poetry, the art, the enjoyment of the religious life, as our ordinary ethical action is its prose, its work and toil. This accounts for the fact that we can not be satisfied long with anything short of an artistic form of worship. It would be a mistake, of course, to suppose that all the bliss of worship springs from the artistic form in which worship clothes itself; but that this is one source of that bliss must certainly be admitted. Hence worship and art can never be permanently divorced. Pictures, organs, music, may, in a fit of Puritanic fervor, be legislated out of the churches; but when the fit is past they will ever come back again. The religious mind, when in its normal condition, will ever demand that worship should take something of an artistic form. There must be a certain rhythm and harmony in its several parts. This is true of prayer and sermon as well as of hymn and music. A true sermon must be a piece of art, no less than the hymn or anthem; and so also must be the church in which the congregation assembles.

But that this is not a complete theory of Christian worship is evident from the fact that, in the New Testament, the acts of worship—that is, social or congregational worship—are brought into intimate relation to edification. In the 14th chapter of 1 Corin-

thians, St. Paul directs that every thing in social worship—praying, preaching, prophesying, speaking with tongues—should be done with a view to the edification of the Church. To the end of edification it was necessary that “all things should be done decently and in order.” The congregation is not merely, in its worship, to express its faith and piety, nor to present itself as a sacrifice to God, nor to please itself by means of its own exercises, but it is to edify itself; its members are to be made better and holier in consequence of its worship. This teleological side of cultus, however, fails to receive due recognition in this poetical theory.

An adequate conception of the nature of Christian cultus can only be derived from a correct idea of the Church; for cultus is the function of the Church. Into a full discussion of the nature of the Church, however, we can not here enter. We will have to content ourselves with the bare statement of a few fundamental principles. The Church is in the New Testament defined as the body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. Of course, this language is metaphorical. It is, however, not difficult to discover the underlying reality. It means that the Church is the society of Christian believers united in one spiritual organism by the omnipresent life and spirit of Christ. The Church is an organism, that is, a whole whose parts are intrinsically related to it, developing from within by the force of an immanent principle, and having reference to an end within its own constitution. But the Church is an organism which has Christ in it as its governing, energizing, vitalizing spirit. Now as an organism, self-maintaining and self-developing, the activity of the Church must resolve itself into the polaric opposites of self-representation, or self-manifestation, and self-edification. And as an organism which has Christ in it, as its quickening and ruling spirit, the activity of the Church must be both divine and human. The action of any organism is of the two-fold nature just described. It is, first, representational, having for its end merely the manifestation of its nature and life. To what end does the plant grow and bloom? In the first place merely to set forth its

character in the world of phenomena. But, then, this self-activity of an organism has for its end also the preservation and development of itself. The organism grows by the exhibition of its own energy. This polaric distinction, then, must belong to all the functions of the Church; they must be both representational and teleological, or edificational. They must have their end, on the one hand, in the self-expression and self-manifestation of the spiritual life that is already in the Church, and, on the other hand, in the further promotion and development of that life, both extensively and intensively.*

Christian cultus, then, is in the first place a representational activity, whose end is the expression of the faith and piety existing in the Church. In order that there may be divine cultus or worship there must be a Christian congregation possessing a certain amount of real Christian life. It is not the design of worship to create a congregation. A missionary in a heathen land would not now expect to convert the heathen by performing acts of Christian worship before their eyes. Roman Catholic missionaries during the Middle Ages may have entertained such notions, and proclaimed the conversion of the heathen when they gazed with superstitious awe upon the performance of Christian ceremonies; but the time for that is now past. Christian worship presupposes the existence of a Christian congregation, and consists in the expression and self-manifestation of the Christian life therein at hand. The Christian life, as the highest form of the religious life in humanity, includes instincts of prayer, of homage, of adoration, of sacrifice; and in the exercise of these instincts, as in the exercise of all instinct, there is a certain satisfaction or a certain enjoyment. In Christian worship there is a play of religious feeling, or emotion, in which there is positive enjoyment or bliss. The "getting happy" of the revival conventicle is a rude travesty of this element of worship, but it is a valuable testimony to an important reality. In this respect,

* For a more complete discussion of the polaric distinctions in the nature and activity of the Church see Ebrard's *Praktische Theologie*, p. 45 sq., which we have followed in the above.

then, worship is allied to art, which likewise has its end in the feeling of pleasure to which it ministers. The artist has no other aim than to give expression to the ideal of beauty which fills and thrills his soul; and his enjoyment consists in the exercise of his art and in the contemplation of its result. And so the Christian engages in acts of worship, not because it is his duty to do so, nor because he thinks of adding anything to God's glory, nor yet because he expects to be made better thereby; but because of the stirring of the religious impulse within him, to which he feels that he *must* give expression, and from the expression of which he receives a satisfaction or pleasure that is altogether unique in its nature. That pleasure, while in some respects it resembles the pleasure of art, is yet by no means the same as this. It receives its essential contents and character from the *nature* of Christian worship. The *essence* of Christian worship consists in personal communion with God, or in self-conscious intercourse of the human spirit with the Divine, which is the source of all truth and goodness and beauty. And the enjoyment that springs from worship, therefore, is the joy that comes from the communion of kindred and loving spirits, as well as from the contemplation of the goodness and beauty which are attributes of the Divine Being.

But while it is representational, Christian cultus is at the same time also a teleological activity, having its end in the edification and growth of the Church. This view is distinctively recognized by St. Paul in the directions given to the Corinthians (I. Cor. 14). Here the Apostle discusses various parts of Christian worship, especially that ecstatic speaking with tongues, consisting in the rapturous utterance, in inarticulate sounds, of feelings too large and deep for utterance in grammatical speech, which was a peculiar phenomenon in some of the Apostolic churches, and directs that all these things shall be done, not merely for the satisfaction of individuals, but with a view to the benefit of the congregation. "Let all things be done unto edifying," says the Apostle. The same view is implied also in what is said about the exercise of singing in Christian worship (See

Eph. 5 : 19 and Col. 3 : 16). The Apostle Paul would doubtless have been far from endorsing the idea that in singing "the congregation merely preaches to itself," and that the design of this exercise is simply to stir up pious feelings in the worshippers. And yet the Apostle does recognize instruction and admonition as one of the ends of this exercise. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly," he says, "teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your heart unto God." Singing, according to this statement, is a performance rendered unto God, a representational, a sacrificial activity; but it is at the same time also a performance having for its end the growth of the congregation in faith and piety.

That edification is an end and result of divine worship is also the teaching of experience. True worship tends to make men morally as well as spiritually better and purer. It has a sanctifying and transforming influence upon the members of the Church. It ministers to the illumination of the understanding in relation to God and divine things, to the purification of the feelings and to the strengthening of the will. All this is matter of constant experience. They who assemble regularly in the house of God, with God's people, and take part in the devout worship of God are thereby made morally better and stronger. They are made better able to resist the temptations, bear the sorrows and perform the duties of life. And this increase of moral strength, we hold, is not merely a result of the reflex influence proceeding from acts of worship, but a result of that personal communion with God in Christ in which Christian worship essentially consists. There is thus fulfilled in Christian experience the sentiment expressed by the Psalmist: "The Lord shall send thee help from the sanctuary, and strengthen thee out of Zion" (Ps. 20 : 2).

But as the Church is a divine-human organism, an organism informed and animated by the Spirit of Christ, it follows that cultus, as a function of the Church, must be an activity in which there are united both divine and human factors or elements. There

must be a human factor, an activity or agency of man having God for its object; and there must be a divine factor, an activity or agency of God having man for its object. These two factors may also be designated respectively by the terms *subjective* and *objective*; or by the terms *sacrificial* and *sacramental*, if they be used in a somewhat broad sense, as they are by some, especially German, writers. The sacrificial element, then, embraces the æsthetic, and the sacramental the pedagogic factor of cultus; and the former belongs to the representational, the latter to the teleological side.

There is, then, a sacrificial element in cultus; for in the self-representation or manifestation of the life of the Church which takes place in cultus there is not merely a general exhibition without reference to any particular object, but a specific self-presentation to God. The congregation offers and presents itself to God in prayer and song, in confession and almsgiving. This is its *sacrifice*. That such sacrifice is not to be regarded in the nature of a meritorious work, putting God under obligation to the worshipper, we have already seen; and it is scarcely necessary to add that it is not to be regarded, either in the nature of a propitiatory performance by means of which an angry Deity is supposed to be appeased and His good will obtained. That is a pagan notion which deserves to be eliminated not merely from the theory of cultus, but from theology in general. But if worship, in its sacrificial element, be not meritorious nor propitiatory has it, then, no significance as value for God? To affirm this would imply another than the Christian conception of God; it would imply that God is not a living and personal being, and that He is neither capable of sensibilities nor of judgments of appreciation. In this view God would become a mere blind force, and the act of worship would be emptied of all meaning. This is the conclusion reached by the heathen when he has found out that his idol is a mere stone, but has not yet progressed to the notion of a supersensible, spiritual deity.

The act of worship must be regarded as having value for God; that is to say, it must be regarded as affecting God agree-

ably or of pleasing Him. God as a personal being, in whose likeness we are made, must be capable of being pleased as well as displeased. And there are two things in worship by reason of which it may be said to be a pleasure to God: first, *love*, or the sincere purpose to please; and, secondly, the *beauty* or propriety of its form. Worship, to be true, must be sincere; it must be the sincere utterance of a loving heart, and must be *intended* for the pleasure of God. But whatever is done with the sincere *purpose* of pleasing God must in so far really *be* pleasing to Him. In this way we can understand how the animal sacrifices of primitive times, though proceeding from a misunderstanding of the character of God, were yet pleasing to God. A child's efforts to gratify a mother by assisting in her work will be gratifying, although there may be little objective value in the child's service. It is the *will to please* that really is pleasing in the child's kindness to the mother. And so it is the will to please God in the act of worship that will be pleasing to Him.

But worship is pleasing to God also by reason of what we have called its propriety or *beauty*. We have seen that worship is allied to art. It has an æsthetic character. It has regard for beauty. It draws upon the arts of architecture, music, poetry, eloquence. The Scriptures speak of worshipping God "in the beauty of holiness," that is, *in holy beauty*. See Pss. 29: 2 and 96: 9; also I. Chron. 16: 29. This is one of the sources of the pleasure which we derive from worship—not the only, nor the chief source, but yet a real source of pleasure. The question then arises: Is this also a source of pleasure to God? Can God be pleased with the beauty which we consecrate to His worship in temple, hymn and speech? This question we believe must be answered in the affirmative. We hold that what is a joy to His children must be a joy also to the Father. The beauty of the flower, which is a pleasure to us, exists because beauty is a pleasure to God. The divine love of beauty has *pleased itself* by creating forms of beauty in positions where no human eye can ever behold them.

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark, unfathomed caves of ocean bear ;
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its fragrance on the desert air."

So sings the poet. But the beauty of gem and flower, though hidden in ocean's depths or in desert wastes, is not wasted beauty. Though not seen by any human eye, it is seen by the universal eye of God, to which it is a joy forever. But if God has a sense for beauty, and an appreciation of beauty, then the beauty of worship also, as well as the beauty of art in general, must have real value for God. The loving self-presentation to God of a Christian congregation, in the beauty of holiness, therefore, constitutes a real sacrifice—or a sacrificial element—in Christian cultus. In order to prevent misunderstanding here it may be well, perhaps, to add that in Christian worship love and beauty must ever be united. When separated from love, or from truth, beauty is no longer pleasing either to God or to man, and in fact ceases to be beauty and becomes merely meretricious adornment.

But there is also a *Sacramental*, or a divine, element in cultus. By a sacrament in general we understand the presence of a spiritual reality or power in a visible form. We have already seen that the activity of the Church as the mystical body of Christ, while on the one hand an activity of men, is on the other hand an activity of Christ in the Spirit. This divine activity is exercised in various acts and forms of cultus ; and this is what gives to cultus its sacramental character. There is, then, in cultus not simply an activity of man terminating upon God and designed for His pleasure—a sweet smelling savor unto the Lord, but also an activity of God terminating upon man and designed for his edification and sanctification. What the elements of nature—air, light, heat, soil, moisture—are to the development of vegetable life, that the divine energies, working in and through the cultus of the Church, are to the development of the spiritual life of man. Christ says: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." And it is this presence of Christ in the Church, and the working of His

Spirit in the various forms and acts of cultus, that gives to cultus its objective teleological character, in virtue of which it ministers to the edification and sanctification of the worshippers. We have in modern times learned to appreciate the influence and value of environment in the development of life. Now Christian cultus constitutes the appropriate environment for the development of Christian character. It forms a bosom of gracious influences and powers by the operation of which the worshippers are transformed into Christ's image from glory to glory.

These two elements or factors of cultus, now, the sacrificial and the sacramental, belong to *all* the acts of cultus, but in different degrees and proportions. The sacrificial element is represented mainly in prayer, and praise (song), and oblation (alms-giving); the sacramental element in the word of God (reading and preaching), and in the sacraments properly so called. But while this distinction is valid, it remains true, nevertheless, that the sacrificial and sacramental, or the human and the divine, elements belong in some degree to all acts of cultus. Thus while prayer may be considered mainly as a sacrificial or human activity, yet the divine energy is not wholly wanting therein; for, as St. Paul says, Rom. 8: 26: "The Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered." So the sermon, in so far as it is a confession of the truth of the gospel already appropriated by the Church, is sacrificial and representational in character, like creed, hymn and prayer, while in so far as it aims at the further appropriation of the truth, under the accompanying operation of the Holy Spirit, it is sacramental and teleological. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper involves the two sides or elements in proportions approaching nearest to equality. It is a sacrament, inasmuch as the Lord therein communicates Himself personally to the congregation for its spiritual edification and growth; and a sacrifice, or Eucharist, inasmuch as the congregation therein offers and presents itself to the Lord. And these two sides will be equal to each other whenever the self-presentation of the congregation

shall be as complete and whole as is the self-presentation of the Lord.

As to the number, forms and order of succession of the various acts of cultus no definite conclusion can be reached from merely *a priori* principles. From the general conception of Christian worship as a direct communion of the spirit of man with the Spirit of God, we cannot determine what precise acts should be embraced in the outward arrangement of cultus, and in what particular order they should succeed each other. Nor does the New Testament furnish any rules or precepts concerning this point. The New Testament mentions various acts of worship, and sometimes gives the condensed contents of prayers, but we are never informed how these acts were related to each other, and in what order they occurred. The New Testament contains only fundamental principles concerning the nature and acts of divine worship, not a formal code of laws. The system of Christian worship does not rest upon formal divine statutes, but is the vital product of the spirit of worship in the Church. Hence for our knowledge of the number and kind of its several acts, and of their relations, we are dependent upon history.

Now the most constant and most prominent acts of worship, as they have appeared in the development of Christian cultus, are prayer, consisting of confession of sin and of faith, of thanksgiving, petition and intercession; praise or song; reading of Scripture and preaching; administration of the sacraments; offering of alms, and benediction. The determination of the proper order of succession among these acts, and of the proper manner of performing them, belongs to the science of Liturgics. We notice here but one question, namely, the question as to the central or fundamental element of Christian cultus. In regard to this question two opposite views prevail. One view makes the sermon central; the other makes the Eucharist central. The history of liturgical practice decidedly favors the former of these views; for the leading liturgies are certainly constructed upon the principle of the centrality of the Eucharist. And this practice is in harmony also with the fundamental conception of Chris-

tian worship. That conception, as we have already seen, is the idea of a conscious personal communion between the worshipper and God in Christ. In worship the person of the worshipper comes into direct contact with the person of God in Christ; and this contact is a source both of spiritual enjoyment and of spiritual strength to the worshipper. Now in what act of cultus does this idea of personal communion with God come to its clearest expression? Manifestly in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which must, therefore, be declared to be the center of Christian cultus, or, as it is expressed in our Order of Worship, "the inmost sanctuary of the whole Christian worship."

This does not mean that the Lord's Supper must necessarily be the most *prominent external feature* of worship, or that it must be celebrated on every occasion of worship; but only that the idea of communion of Christians with each other and with the Lord, which is represented in the Lord's Supper, must be the central and ruling idea of the whole and of every single act of cultus. This idea of personal union with the Lord must be the ruling idea even of the sermon. Not only must the sermon be animated and sustained by the feeling of union with the Lord on the part of the preacher, but its object also must be the origination or the deepening of a similar feeling of union with the Lord on the part of the hearers; and this is the fundamental idea expressed in the institution of the Lord's Supper.

But the preaching of the gospel, or the ministration of the word, is the most important means for the realization of this idea in the lives and experiences of men. That idea cannot be realized by a magical operation, but only by a moral process involving the faculties of feeling, intelligence and will, which can only be reached and influenced by the rational and moral ministry of the word. Hence we see the importance of the sermon relative to all other acts of cultus. We believe, indeed, that Luther went too far when he said that "a Christian congregation should never come together unless the Word of God is preached and prayer offered, and that where the word is not *preached* it would be better neither to sing, nor to read, nor to come together at all."

This is, doubtless, an extreme view ; and yet even this view is not as hurtful to the Christian life as is that which suppresses the sermon altogether, and suffers the whole of cultus to be absorbed in the sacrament of the Eucharist, which is then transformed into a meritorious sacrifice for the living and the dead, producing its effects *ex opere operato*. The sermon, though not the central, must, in Protestantism at least, be the most prominent feature of cultus ; but the whole of cultus must be pervaded and ruled by the central idea of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. And this idea also should be allowed to control the arrangement and furniture of the place of worship, that is, of the church. The pulpit must have a prominent place corresponding to the importance of the sermon ; and the altar must be in its proper, central position, appropriately representing the union of the sacrificial and of the sacramental elements in cultus. That the term altar, in the sense of an article of church furniture, does not occur in the New Testament, signifies nothing ; for the term pulpit does not occur either ; yet pulpit and altar are required in order to the completeness of a Christian place of worship.

II.

THE ONE FLOCK OF CHRIST.

BY PROF. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D. D.

The story of the good Shepherd, told by Jesus in the tenth chapter of the Gospel of John, is a favorite one with most Christians, especially because of the tender personal relation between Christ and His people which it so clearly and touchingly illustrates and sets forth. This personal relation is usually considered with reference to the individuals of the flock. I propose at this time to consider it with reference to the flock as a whole.

Jesus Christ is the Shepherd of each one who knows His voice ; but He is also the one Shepherd of a flock which embraces the whole body of Christians.

No one can be a rightful member of that flock who does not know the Shepherd's voice, who has not entered by Him into the fold, who does not go in and out at His call. And such sheep will not fail of recognition by the Shepherd. He saves them at the cost of His own life and no thief or robber can snatch a single lamb out of His hands. No Pharisee or Sadducee can exclude a single one of them from His love.

At least two Messianic passages of the old Testament are at the basis of this similitude. The prophet Ezekiel (34 : 11-31) predicts that Yahweh the faithful Shepherd of Israel will recover His scattered sheep, restore them to their land again, and make with them a new covenant of peace and blessing. At the time of this prediction the people were scattered in exile. The prophet sees them restored to the Holy Land. In the time of Jesus the Jewish people had for many centuries been dwelling in the land of Israel worshipping their God in the temple at Jerusalem. There were still multitudes of Jews scattered over the world ; but they were not in exile ; they had the privilege of returning to

Palestine if they chose; they remained in other lands for commercial reasons. Therefore we cannot think of the Jews of the Dispersion when Jesus said, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must lead and they shall hear my voice (John 10: 16); for all of the Jews of the Dispersion were recognized as belonging to the fold of Israel; their offerings were received in the temple, and whenever they made pilgrimages to Jerusalem they entered the holy places as freely as the Jews of Palestine.

By the other sheep not of the fold of Israel, Jesus means Gentiles scattered over the world, whom He was to lead into union with the flock of Israel, making of the two one flock. Jesus recognized that there were in His time sheep of God which did not belong to the race of Jacob; that God was preparing other nations as well as Israel for the Messianic salvation; and that the mission of the Messiah was to gather all the sheep, Jew and Gentile, into one flock. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son" (John 3: 16). "The Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world" (I John 4: 14). The world is the aim of the redemptive activity of Jesus Christ. The Saviour is the Saviour of individuals, each one by himself; but He is more than that; He is the Saviour of the race of man; He is the Saviour of the organism of creation; He is the Saviour of the world.

The goal of redemption is and can only be the comprehension of an infinite variety of individuals, each one in the initial stages of his redemption, saved alone by himself, but gathered into an organism of salvation, in which alone, through the action and reaction of redemptive forces, the salvation of the individual can be completed. Jesus does not propose to save every individual man or thing in the world, but He does propose to save the organism of the world and the organism of humanity. Every man and every thing that obstructs the redemption of the organism will be cut out from it, as one cuts off a dead branch, or prunes a sluggish vine, or removes a corrupt growth from the human body; but every salvable part of the organism will be retained and improved; each will be treated effectively by itself; but each also in its relation to the organism as a whole.

The story also presupposes another prediction of Ezekiel (37: 21-28). The prophet by the joining of two sticks symbolizes the reunion of Israel and Judah under the second David, and predicts that "they all will have one shepherd." The predictive Spirit of Jesus is not confined, like that of Ezekiel, to the two sections of the children of Jacob and to the land of Palestine. The land of Palestine has been transformed for Him into the whole creation. Israel and Judah had for centuries been united; all the tribes of Israel worshipped in union in the temple at Jerusalem.

Jesus, in His vision, sees Jew and Gentile in place of Israel and Judah, and predicts their union under the one Shepherd, the Messianic King. He Himself will effect that union. It is His mission to accomplish it. He will die for His sheep. He will rise from the dead and ascend to His Messianic throne to redeem them. He sends forth His ministers to preach the gospel to the whole creation, and tells them that until the world has heard His gospel and accepted it He will not come again. His advent to judge the world and to accomplish its full salvation will be then, and then only, when all the sheep have been led into the one flock.

The one flock, as a complete and perfect organism, is the goal of the redemptive work of the Messiah, the ideal at the end of the Messianic age. Was it therefore in the mind of Jesus that His sheep should remain scattered or organized in a great number of different flocks until that time? Is the one flock an ideal of the second advent not to be realized until that event? No one can think so who duly considers these words of Jesus and the corresponding teaching of His Apostles. The one flock will not be complete and perfect until the redemptive work of our dispensation has been accomplished, for the reason that until then there still remain persons who have not heard the gospel, who may yet be saved. The full complement of the Gentiles and all Israel have not yet been gathered into the flock. But that any of the sheep that know the voice of the Shepherd should remain apart from the one flock is out of harmony with the teaching of Jesus and of the entire New Testament. There is one Shepherd

for each of the sheep and one only Shepherd for the whole body of the sheep. It is altogether abnormal for the sheep to be scattered into different flocks. The only normal relation is one flock, one Shepherd.

When now we look at the history of Christianity, and especially at the present condition of the Christian world, it is evident that all Christians are not gathered in the one flock. The Roman Catholic Church recognizes no other flock of Christ than that embraced in its own fold. There are other sheep not of its fold, but they are scattered sheep and in peril of damnation. Protestants distinguish between the visible and the invisible Church. They recognize that the visible Church is broken up into different organizations, but they regard all true Christians as members of the invisible Church. No visible Church at present coincides with real Christianity, for it excludes some real Christians and it includes some who are not real Christians. The one Shepherd, looking down from His heavenly throne, recognizes every one of His sheep whether they are included in the ecclesiastical organizations or not, and in whatever ecclesiastical organization they may be. And He does not recognize as His sheep any one who knows Him not, however eminent he may be in ecclesiastical affairs. Those whom the Good Shepherd recognizes as His sheep, by virtue of that recognition belong to one flock. What right has any ecclesiastic to exclude them? If Jesus, the one Shepherd of the flock, knows them as His, those under-shepherds who refuse to recognize them are in rebellion against Christ. It is not sufficient for Protestants to say that these Christians are in the invisible Church, for they ought to be in the visible Church likewise. Those who are excluded from the visible Church are deprived of all the advantages to be derived from the organization. No one can exclude them from the Shepherd's love; but they may be excluded from the redemptive grace, which flows through the means of grace which are in the hands of the Church alone. Jesus would lead them into the one flock, but, as in the New Testament times, so there have always been, and are now, Pharisees who obstruct the way to the

Kingdom, and with pious phrases and devout requirements prevent the union of Christ's sheep with the one flock.

Many Protestants seems to have given such an undue emphasis to the invisible Church as to obscure the importance of the visible Church, and minimize the great wrong done to the individual Christian by excluding him from the organization of the Church in this world, and the still greater wrong done to the one flock of Christ by scattering it into a number of different organizations. The failure of Christianity to realize the ideal of our Saviour cannot be any other than sinful. The origination and perpetuation of divisive measures in the Church are sins which should not be condoned. Those who under the plea of discipline and use of the power of the keys exclude Christians from the Church are guilty of a sin of an enormity which it is difficult to estimate. It is a sin against the one flock. It is a sin against the one Shepherd. It is what is known in law as *Crimen Majestatis*, *lèse majesté*, treason to the Church and to Christ.

1. It was not the design of Jesus Christ that His one flock should be divided by racial differences.

No greater racial difference could exist than that between Jew and Gentile. And yet Jesus proposed to make the two into one flock. In the Epistle to the Ephesians Paul says that Christ "made Jew and Gentile one;" "Broke down the middle wall of partition between them;" "created in Himself of the twain one new man;" "reconciled them both in one body unto God." (2: 13-16.) In the Epistle to the Colossians it is said that in putting on the new man "there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, free man; but Christ is all and in all." (3: 11.)

The great divisions of Christianity are on racial lines. The Greek and Latin Churches are divided by racial lines of cleavage. The Latin race combines with the Celtic in the propagation of the Roman type of Christianity. The Greek race combines with the Russian in the conservation of the Greek type. The Copts, the Armenians and the Syrians remain apart, except so far as they have been compelled by poverty and oppression to seek refuge

in the arms of Rome. The German race is essentially Protestant. All these racial divisions have resulted from the intolerance of one race toward another. Christianity was designed to comprehend all races, not to make a Greek into a Jew, or a Jew into a Roman, or a Roman into a German; but to comprehend these and all others in one flock, in which all that is essential to every race should be conserved and combined in the higher unity of a Christianity which comprehends all the races of mankind.

The ecclesiastics of Christianity have been more intent upon constructing sheepfolds than in gathering sheep into the flock of Christ, and they have constructed such small folds that the flock of Christ could not get into any of them. And they have made the doors so low and narrow that it has been impossible for many to enter therein who were anxious to do so. Jesus came to save the world and to gather the different races into one flock. His under-shepherds have sought to save certain kinds of sheep that were of the approved stock.

The races will doubtless continue to live apart; but the racial types of Christianity should abandon their efforts to impose one type upon another and recognize the legitimacy of various racial types in the common Christianity. It is a folly for us to think that our missionaries can ever succeed in making over Africans into Europeans, or Mongolians into Anglo-Saxons. Jesus Christ sent His apostles to preach the gospel to all the world; let us beware lest we adulterate it with our Latin, Greek or Germanic notions.

2. It is not the mind of Christ that his flock should be divided by national distinctions.

There is much less excuse for these than for the racial. Racial distinctions are rooted in great physical and temperamental characteristics of human nature. National distinctions, while in some respects minor forms of these, are often also artificial, and determined by the results of war or diplomacy. Christianity did not overflow the barriers of Judaism, in order to limit itself to the boundaries of the Roman Empire. It was never the mind of the ancient or mediæval Church that the unity of Christ's flock

should be divided by national lines. It remained for the successors of the Reformers to commit this sin. The Reformers were obliged from the necessities of their situation to organize national Churches; but the Reformed Church in Switzerland and Germany, in France and in Holland, regarded itself as one. The Lutherans of Germany and Scandinavia did not regard themselves as separated by the Baltic Sea. The Church of England did not originally separate itself from the Reformed Churches of the Continent, but recognized them as true Churches, and welcomed their ministry and their people. But in the strifes of the seventeenth century the separating national spirit developed itself and wrought disunion in the Church; the greatest sin in this regard was committed in our own country.

It was the desire of the supreme judicatories of Scotland, Holland and Germany that all the Reformed in the American colonies should be combined in one Church organization. The honor of making this proposition was given to a minister of the Reformed Church. In 1744 Dorsius appeared before the Presbyterian Synod with a proposition for a union of the Dutch and German Reformed with the Presbyterians; and presented letters from the Synods in Holland in favor of such a plan. This magnificent opportunity was thrown away by the Presbyterians because of their own division into the Old and New Sides. As I have elsewhere said "twelve Presbyterian ministers by persisting in the wrong which they had done in dividing the American Presbyterian Church threw away the one great opportunity, which has never since been repeated, of combining the entire Reformed and Presbyterian strength of America in one compact organization." (Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, p. 284.) This failure resulted in the continued existence of two branches of the Presbyterian Church, representing the Scotch-Irish and the Puritan types and the Dutch Reformed, German Reformed and French Reformed; and these have been the parents of divisions which exist to the present day. Very much the same state of things exists among the Lutherans. Although there are other reasons for their divisions, many of them are based entirely upon national distinctions.

It is difficult to see valid reasons why the national Churches of the Old World should be perpetuated in our United States. The State puts the Church to shame. Any man from any nation may become an American citizen, and is welcomed into either of the great political parties, and may, if worthy, be chosen to office; but in the Christian Churches of America it is still important to know whether a man retains the religious peculiarities of certain national Churches of Europe, and whether his religious ancestors came from Scotland or Ireland, Germany or Holland, Scandinavia or England. And in not a few instances these daughter Churches of America claim to be more orthodox than their mothers, and think that they may give the law in ritual and dogma to the Old World.

The Roman Catholic Church sets us a good example here. There we see Germans and Irishmen, Italians and Spanish, French Canadian and Hungarian, all working harmoniously in the same organization. Why should this not be so among the Lutheran and the Reformed? The objector says: Why, you wish to make our Christianity colorless! Can a color be maintained only by keeping it apart from all other colors? Is it necessary to have every color separated from every other color by a chasm of darkness? The richest colors are in the rainbow, where they blend to constitute the pure light. They may be brought out with a prism whenever they are needed. So the Church of Christ will never shine in the true, pure light of the Redeemer until all these national colors are blended. Any one of these colors may still be shown when needed; but why should they be always flaunting their peculiarities before you? Why, for instance, should the blue flag of Presbyterianism be always waving in your face?

3. It is against the mind of Christ that his flock should be broken up by differences of social condition.

In early Christianity the bondslave and the freeborn citizen were gathered together into one flock. It was not deemed important to have a separate Church for slaves or for freedmen. The early Church did not organize its congregations into social

clubs, putting the poor into one organization, the middle classes into another, and the wealthy and nobility into a third or a fourth. It was not necessary to organize a Salvation Army to preach the Gospel to the slums, still less Volunteers to reach the artisan class. It is the honor of the Roman Catholic Church that in all ages and in every land it has remained faithful in this respect to Jesus Christ. It has not interfered with social distinctions outside of the Church, but it has always ignored them in the Church. It has remained for American Protestants to organize special denominations for freedmen, and to establish congregations on the principles of social clubs. A representative Methodist preacher recently said in my hearing that Methodism had lost its hold on the lower classes, and was rapidly losing its hold on the middle classes, and it never had any hold on the higher classes. If this is so, it is difficult to see that Methodism has any future. This preacher was certainly too pessimistic, but he clearly shows the evil tendencies that there are among Protestants to classify the people by social considerations. Such a classification of the sheep of Christ is contrary to the spirit of Christianity. Christ Himself will eventually separate the sheep from the goats, but where can we find that He or His apostles ever separated His sheep one from another? Even the goats are permitted to remain with the sheep until the Day of Judgment and the Messiah Himself makes the separation.

4. It is not the mind of Christ that His flock should be divided by differences of doctrine.

It would be difficult to find greater differences in doctrine than between the Pharisees and the Sadducees in the time of Jesus, and yet they did not find it necessary to organize two different ecclesiastical organizations. They worshipped God in the same temple. Paul had conflicts with Barnabas (Acts 15: 39), and then with Peter and with James (Gal. 2: 11-13). He asserted his independence, but did not break the unity of the Church. Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians remained in the one flock, though the Church of Corinth was sadly torn by three or four contending factions (1 Cor. 1: 10-13).

It is necessary that Christians should grow in their experience of Christianity and in their knowledge of its doctrine; but those whose eyes have been opened to see farther and wider than their fellows are not on that account to exclude from the flock those who are too conservative to follow them. Still less should they depart from the flock at the dictation of those who think that they have erred from traditional orthodoxy.

Compulsory subscription to creeds has ever been a wedge of division. Wedge after wedge has been driven into the body of Christ. Numberless Christians have been cut off from the main body and forced to constitute separate bodies. In no age has this wedge of dogma been so disastrously used as in the Churches of the Reformation. The Lutheran and the Reformed divided in the Reformation itself. In the Lutheran body the party of Melancthon contended for more than a century against the stricter Lutherans, but never divided the Church. In the Reformed Churches the division went further, and the Arminians were cut off from the Calvinistic Churches. Then among the Calvinists, Old School and New School, waged a long war, but did not divide in Europe. It remained for the American Presbyterian Church to rise to the climax of division by erecting Old School and New School in different denominations.

In Germany the differences between Lutherans and Reformed have for the most part passed away. In Holland Calvinists and Arminians are no longer at war. Old School and New School no longer contend in France. These divisive issues are dead in Europe; why should their ghosts continue to divide American Christianity?

The German Reformed have the distinguished honor in this country of remaining undivided. There have been controversies among their Churches of much greater importance than those which have rent asunder the Dutch Reformed and the British Presbyterians, but the German Reformed have ever remained true to the genuine type of the Heidelberg Catechism. The German Reformed Church has retained the comprehensive character of the original Reformed theology rather than the

distinctive Calvinistic peculiarities of that type. She has the graceful form and well rounded proportions of a blooming daughter of the Reformation. One does not see in her, as in so many Reformed Churches, the sharp visage and the angular proportions of a venerable dame who has spent her days and wasted her strength in fruitless contentions with her own flesh and blood. Wherefore the German Reformed occupy the best position in our country to mediate between the different Churches of the Reformation and to take the lead in the reunion movement.

Moreover, the emphasis which this theological school, once of Mercersburg, now of Lancaster, has always given to the Apostles' Creed enables it cordially to unite with the Protestant Episcopal Church in urging the second of the Chicago-Lambeth articles as a platform for the Church of the future, "the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith." (See Briggs, Whither, p. 262.)

Modern ecclesiastics take upon themselves a very great responsibility when they ask young men who would enter the ministry, to subscribe to statements of dogma which were unknown to Christian antiquity, and which would exclude the Nicene Fathers from the flock of Christ. It is doubtful whether Christ's Apostles could receive ordination in many of our denominations. There are some of them who would pronounce the Saviour of the world a heretic if he should again enter our world as a reformer of theology and morals.

Let the orthodox Lutherans adhere to their orthodoxy. Let the various types of Calvinism, supra-lapsarian, infra-lapsarian, Old School and New School, maintain their theories. Let the Melancthonians and Arminians, the Princetonians and every other school of doctrine, contend manfully for their opinions in the forum of scholarship; but he who erects any of these party distinctions as fences for the flock of Christ is guilty of the *Lèse Majesté*. He divides the one flock of Christ; he rejects sheep whom the one Shepherd owns. The time has well-nigh come when Jesus Christ will make it clear that true orthodoxy is to have the mind

of Christ, and to think of men and things as Christ thinks of them, and that He is the heterodox man and schismatic who pushes from him any one of the sheep of the good Shepherd.

5. It is not the mind of Christ that His flock should be divided by differences as to worship.

The Church of Great Britain was torn with controversy for centuries by the persistent effort of the British crown and the English Bishops to impose uniformity of worship upon the ministry and people. Out of that controversy has come all that complexity of worship which is seen in the numerous denominations which were born in Great Britain. The Reformed and the Lutherans of the Continent never suffered seriously from such controversies. They always had liturgical worship, but granted considerable freedom in its use, and did not exact rigid uniformity. There have been liturgical controversies in the Reformed Churches of America, due, if I mistake not, more to their environment than to any internal evolution. A happy result of these controversies in the German Reformed Church has been the agreement of the various parties to live together in peace in the same communion. They have a revised liturgy, which is one of the best. It is not imposed, but is optional, to be used in whole or in part or not at all. They present, therefore, an ideal situation for all the Churches of the Reformation which shows the only legitimate way for the solution of the liturgical controversies of British Christianity.

The House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, notwithstanding their attachment to that marvel of liturgies, the Book of Common Prayer, have said in the Chicago Declaration, in their proffer of reunion to the Christian world, "that in things of human choice relating to modes of worship and discipline or to traditional customs this Church is ready in the spirit of love and humility to forego all preferences of their own."

If such a spirit animates the Protestant Episcopal Communion and such a practice exists in the Reformed Communion, there remain no serious obstacles to the solution of the liturgical controversies of Christendom. The practice of the Reformed Church

might be extended so that the Book of Common Prayer should be used in the congregations as well as the Reformed Liturgy, both optional in whole or in part. Let Luther's Liturgy in its various forms have freedom of use also. Such a practice should unite Reformed, Anglicans and Lutherans.

Let the congregations use ceremonies or not, as they please, and whatever ceremonies they please, without let or hindrance. Let the local church have freedom in all such matters. If such a policy could be adopted—and it is only a logical evolution of the spirit of the Chicago-Lambeth Declaration and the practice of the Reformed Churches—then all liturgical barriers to reunion would disappear. The reunited Church will worship God in much grander strains, when every form of Christian prayer and of Christian song, of human voice and instrument of music, of culture and art, of vesture and of ceremony, shall combine in the grander harmonies of earthly oratorios, which will embrace as infinite variations as the heavenly choirs depicted in the Book of Revelations. (5 : 8-13; 7 : 9-12.)

6. It is not in accord with the mind of Christ that His flock should be divided by differences in Church government.

The study of the New Testament ought to convince us that only the most general principles of Church government were known and practiced by the Apostolic Church. Theories of Church government by divine right, held by the founders of many of the existing denominations, have been abandoned by the scholars in those denominations. Church history teaches us that the government of the Church has been in great measure influenced by the civil government. The differences between civil and ecclesiastical government in our time are largely due to the survival of more ancient forms of government in the Church after they have been modified or abandoned by the state. There is no existing church government which has the right to say to others, We only have the authority of Jesus Christ and you must submit to us.

The elaborate systems of Church government are divisive. They set up fence after fence, barrier after barrier, limiting the capacity of the fold of the Church, and so compel great masses

of the sheep to remain scattered or to gather in separate flocks. The larger part of the ecclesiastical machinery in our denominations is essentially schismatic. It is un-Christian or anti-Christian and must eventually be destroyed. The good Shepherd will not tolerate much longer the schismatic folds which men have constructed to divide his flock.

The Protestant Churches of the Continent of Europe have not been divided by questions of Church government. British Christianity has committed the great sin of dividing the flock of Christ by questions of polity. Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, Independent, Friend, Methodist—these all represent divisions in British Christianity by theories of Church government. There are certain advantages in each one of these polities, but each one of them has unfolded its own peculiar form at the expense of certain advantages contained in the others. Richard Baxter in 1653 led in the organization of the Worcester Association in which he says: "The main body of our Association were men that thought the Episcopal, Presbyterian and Independents had each of them some good in which they excelled the other two parties, and each of them some mistakes, and that to select out of all three the best part and leave the worst, was the most desirable (and ancient) form of government." (Briggs Whither, p. 235, Church Concord, preface, London, 1691.) These men were right; but the seventeenth century was intolerant to such noble principles. They are the ones which lead to the reunion of Christendom. We should be willing to give up everything that is not essential in order to the inestimable boon of recovering the unity of Christ's Church. Those who have this spirit will readily agree with the League of Catholic Unity, that "the historical Episcopate in various forms already prevails extensively throughout the Christian world, and as connected with the Scriptures, the creeds and the sacraments, it might become a bond of organic unity among the Christian denominations by completing their Congregational, Presbyterian or Episcopal systems, and at length recombining them normally in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

The unity of the flock of Christ is entirely consistent with diversity in the sheep. The greater the diversity the grander the unity. From the German Reformed University of Frankfurt on the Oder went forth a great Irenic wave at the beginning of the seventeenth century. That wave bore on its crest the famous sentence "In necessary things Unity, in unnecessary things Liberty, in both Charity." (*Parænesis Votiva*. See *Presbyterian Review*, 1887, p. 745.) Rupertus Meldenius, the author of that sentence, was probably from Melden, on the borders of Bohemia and Silesia, in the midst of all the great religious parties at the beginning of the 17th century. Taking our stand upon that sentence, it would not be difficult to coöperate with the good Shepherd in leading all His sheep into the one flock.

The House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church was the first ecclesiastical body to attempt a definition of these essentials. They make four propositions to Unity which have been called the Quadrilateral. I agreed to them as soon as I read them. (See Huntington's *Peace of the Church*, Preface, 1891; *Presbyterian Review*, 1887, p. 132.)

Let other communions consider them and say whether they are satisfactory or not. If they say not, then they are bound to give their own definition of these essentials. If we could get from the supreme Judicatories of the several denominations their several definitions of these essentials, we could easily compare them and determine whether they might not all be reduced to common factors.

The definition of the essentials of the Church may be regarded as the formal principle of Church Unity. Something more and something better is needed. That definition itself will never be made unless the irresistible force of a material principle compel it. Love is that force. Love, as Rupertus Meldenius clearly saw and strongly stated, is the cementing principle in things necessary and things unnecessary alike. Love has the only eye which can distinguish between the essential and the unessential in Christianity. Love is the reconciling force which unites the sheep to their Shepherd and attaches the sheep one to another—

concentrates and solidifies the flock. Love covers over and puts out of sight a multitude of sins of individuals and of ecclesiastical bodies. Love detects and brings to light all that is good in the individual and in the denomination. Love sacrifices every individual preference and consecrates all to the common weal. Therefore Love is the material principle of Church Unity.

One flock is the ideal of the one Shepherd. Every ideal of the Christ is sure of realization. He prayed shortly before his departure for his disciples that "they may all be one" (John 17: 21). His prayer will certainly be granted by the Father. The Messiah who lives and reigns over the Church has the same ideals and prayers as those He had in His earthly ministry. We know, therefore, that He is at work in heaven and on earth to accomplish the unity of His Church. Woe be to those who obstruct or oppose the plan of the King of the Church. Blessed are those who pray for it, work for it and share in it.

III

THE CHURCH AND THE LABORING CLASSES.

BY C. CLEVER, D. D.

Among the many problems with which the waning century bristles so freely, none clamor more earnestly for a hearing than those which have been raised by labor. There is about them an earnestness and determination which has been begotten in the lowest depths of the human heart. When a man's social, political and physical existence is at stake, we need not wonder if he inquires into the cause of his trouble. If he chances to find it embodied in government, or in any combination, though existing under the protection of law, he will not be slow in demanding redress. An empty flour barrel, a home in peril, and the liberty of country at stake, rouse all his manhood and nerve his arm for a sturdy stroke. When thus driven to bay he is ready to fall upon anything that he imagines lends an influence to his oppressions. He is not always able to discern the form of a friend, since the shadow over all the plain of his existence has disturbed everything. In his calmer moments he discovers his mistake, and none is more ready to make all proper amends. When in a fit of despair, he calls loudly upon everything that promises any relief from his distress. He listens to any voice that has in it a note of triumphant hope. To what does he so sympathetically turn as to the Church. John Stuart Mill, who has given such encouragement to labor movements, has told him that in other days, when the weak were prostrate at the feet of the strong, the Church plead to the strong for the weak (*Dissertation 2:155*). And the pleading was successful. Kings and princes stopped in their mad career of revelry and conquest, and lifted up the prostrate brother who was about to be crushed under the iron hoofs of their prancing steeds. He feels the oppressor's hand heavily

upon him now. He is reminded that the Church is the embodiment of the courage and love of Jesus Christ. Though the clear outlines of that majestic figure, with His pure teachings has grown somewhat dim; yet the traditions have not entirely faded from his mind and heart. Mill again reminds him that in the Middle Ages the Church was the "chief refuge and hope of oppressed humanity" (Dis. 2: 293). He timidly listens to the optimistic views presented from the pulpit, though for a moment he hesitates to make a request, since he is not counted among the elect. But encouraged by the comprehensive invitation, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest," he ventures to supplicate the Church to plead his cause against an oppression, real or imaginary, which endangers all that he holds dear. He is disappointed. He imagines that his pleadings have fallen upon indifferent ears. Expecting an immediate espousal of that cause which compels him to act, he finds a policy of splendid non-interference. It has become a settled policy to keep hands off. The laborer sinks to a lower plane of life, and the separation between the Church and his class grows more ominous.

There is a stubborn resistance to the truth that the mass of laborers have become estranged from the Church. Those who courageously insist upon it are pronounced alarmists. Men are loathe to believe that the accumulated energies of nineteen centuries of Christianity and love would allow such a state of affairs to exist. It is mortifying to our boasted civilization. It puts to shame some of our easy-going ideas about the duties which belong to the Christian life. In all the great cities of both the Old and New World a large proportion of the laborers are outside the pale of the church and never come within the reach of its influences. Overshadowing evils shut out the beneficent beams of the Sun of Righteousness, which has arisen with healing in His wings. In Berlin, the intellectual center of German thought and life, there is but one church to about 20,000 souls. In London there is but one Church to every 3350 people. In New York one to every 2,468. Cardinal Manning asserted a short time before his

death in a public address that nearly three-fourths of the population in London are beyond the influences of the Churches, except in the most general way.

A superficial glance, into one of our Churches on a Sunday morning will show us an assembly of well-to-do people. "The merchants, the clerks, the professional people, the teachers, are not deserting Churches. The proportion of wage earners in the assembly is constantly diminishing. The middle walls of the partition between class and class are becoming as fixed as the laws of the Medes and Persians. In the days of early Christianity a great wave of charity like a mighty current that burst its banks, swept away every impediment to the activity of universal charity among all of the brethren. The brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God were not crystallized in catechetical formula, but they were marvellously active in all the common concerns of social life. It is argued that much of that same spirit could not be introduced into the modern business world. It is true it would stop the exchange. It would blot Wall Street out of existence. It would put into the market whole rows of brownstone mansions and marble palaces. But would it not send a ray of hope into thousands of homes, where now squalor and want have brooded a thick despair, which the most earnest Gospel efforts have thus far been powerless to dispel? We are not able to preach much on the magnificent charity of Barnabas, when he sold all that he had and distributed to the common wants of the brethren. We see in it the ripe fruit of that abounding love begotten of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The pulpit generally explains that as one of the peculiarities of the Apostolic age, which the founder of the Church never intended to be carried out in all subsequent times. I imagine about the only reason we could give for such a conclusion would be the consensus of the commentators. Surely no one would be hardy enough to pronounce that an over-wrought righteousness or an unfortunate excrescence that disfigured the spring time of Church history. It cannot be introduced now, we all admit, but the cannot comes not from the Gospel of Christ, but from the peculiar constitution of modern

society. In the degree that class distinctions assume these granitic forms the difficulties confronting the Church increase.

Dr. Gladden in his *Applied Christianity*, page 162, sums up his conclusions as follows :

It is evident that the average workers, as a class are discontented. They feel that they are not getting their fair share of the gains of advancing civilization.

It is evident that they are becoming more and more widely separated from their employers in social scale.

It is evident that the old relations of friendliness between the two classes are giving place to alienation and enmity.

It is evident that working people have the impression that the Churches are mainly under the control of the capitalists and of those in sympathy with them. If all these things are so, the reasons why the working people are inclined to withdraw from the churches ought also to be plain. It is not the intention of the Church, or of those who are the leaders in Christian work, to give any preference to the wealthy. The goodly man, however, with the gold ring and rich apparel does sit in the high seat, and the poor man in vile raiment must sit yonder.

An effort has been made several times, in different places, by means of circulars to get at the idea which the wage earners have concerning the Church ; and the reasons for their neglect of its privileges. These may be generalized as :

- (1). Inability to appear properly clothed.
- (2). Inability to pay the amount needed to occupy any favorable position in the Church.
- (3). The prominence given to capitalists, who unscrupulously squeeze the very life out of their employees, to add to their ill-gotten gains. The unfortunate feature of all these answers is that they are true. What chance has the honest and good daughter of a hard-working man, with a large family to support, to appear favorably with those who are clothed in purple and fare sumptuously every day. As long as human nature is not wholly sanctified by divine grace, men will feel these things ; and no amount of effort will overcome this unfortunate state. How

can we ask them to come in on a common level and be with those who are gorgeously arrayed out of the wealth that has been produced by the wage earner. To the third and fourth generation he can not fail to feel aggrieved.

There are but few churches which are not managed by men of means rather than by men of character. There does not seem to be anything else for it at this time, so far distant from the millennium.

Since the benevolent spirit of God's people needs such increased development before it will reach the New Testament standard, it must be urged on every occasion from the pulpit. Money, money, MONEY is the cry everywhere and on all occasions. The response will not be made unless the appeals are especially urgent, though these appeals should be made in the most judicious manner; and the poor man would be reminded that he was not required to give if he did not have it, yet it becomes trying beyond endurance. His heart is touched by the appeals that come to him, and yet he cannot make any response. He does not find any fault with the church for undertaking a large work and then calling upon the members to respond. He finally takes the only step that is before him and remains away from the church. The question of the more highly favored generally is not how much can I give, but how much will the position that I occupy in the church ask. There are always certain portions of the church set apart for those who are unable to contribute, but over the entrance to that part of the sanctuary the worshipper sees written, Let all who enter here lay aside every sentiment of manliness and accept what is given. Who ever saw the best portion of the church given up to the poor man? Who ever saw the pews in the center of the church put down to such a price as to be within the means of the humblest? Who ever saw an usher put a poor man with knotty hands and sunbrowned countenance, clothed in patched pantaloons, though as clean as a new pin, in the best pew in the church? There are but few who would expect it, but if they did they would be sadly disappointed. The poor man, in the humble dress, may exhibit in everyday life

the highest type of Christian character, and may be a light shining in the darkness, but all this goes for naught in a large portion of the churches. If Jesus Christ came into the most of our churches without those outward accompaniments that would attract the crowd He would be requested to stand there, or sit here under my footstool. When the poor is unable to pay, how can he help but feel disturbed in mind when his need of charity is thrust upon him so squarely. In the things that belong to his social and physical life he will suffer truly before he will become an object of charity. The same spirit carried into the church will make him but a casual visitor, while the means at hand to contribute towards the expenses of the church run so low.

The poor man is also annoyed at finding himself on a level with those who have consciously or unconsciously been grinding him all the week. As one of the sufferers expresses it, "when the capitalist prays for us one day in the week, and preys on us the other six, it can't be expected that we will have much respect for his Christianity." The capitalist has become separated socially and physically from those who are under his employ. To him the wage earners have become so many machines, out of which he wants a certain dole of brain and brawn to be drawn. The idea of brotherhood has been lost sight of. They do not seem to have one common father. Somewhere in my reading I have seen a comparison between the relation of master and slave in antebellum times and the owner of a large factory and the hands under his employ. The advantages were immensely in favor of the former. Though the announcement at first seems rather startling, yet the slave was not so much of a machine as the large number of employees in these days of tremendous enterprises. What possible relation can there be between a railroad president and those who are under his employ? There cannot be expected anything like personal interest under the most distressing circumstances or sufferings from the most grievous wrong. The Jews groaning under the tax gatherers who preyed upon them to the utmost limit will convey to us some idea of the suffering, which must be endured by the laborers who are under a soulless

corporation. The laborer is continually at the mercy of his employer, and therefore he has no redress. Whenever there must be a curtailment of expenses the laborer feels it. Then there is discord and distress. Then there is a decrease of salary, while with the officers of the corporation or the stockholders there is the usual revenue. When such men are fawned upon and favored in the churches we must not be surprised if the laborers, who have suffered six days from the unrighteous mammon, will not try to make common cause with it in the churches on the Sabbath day. If there is no soul-to-soul struggle in the week and in the common concerns of everyday life there can not be found anything of that sort on the Sabbath Day. Business and religion must go together if religion and business can meet together beneath the droppings of God's house.

This unfortunate state of affairs has not been wholly a one-sided arrangement. There have been wrongs on both sides. The laboring class has been over-sensitive. They have refused to submit to certain annoyances that belong of necessity to their lot. When they have not been able to gain their ends they have taken the management of affairs largely in their own hands. The result has been a generation of Ishmaelites instead of children according to promise. The deliverance which they so earnestly seek cannot be found in the use of means which are the favorite stock in trade of demagogues. Shæffle, the famous and able social economist, says: "The social questions of the present day may, indeed, be *regarded* by the political economist exclusively in their economical aspect, but they can never be *solved* in all their bearings without coöperation of all the moral potencies of society." (Luthardt, Vol. 3, p. 376.) How easy it is for men to fall into the idea that relief can be found in temporal means. While "there are many who admit, indeed, a mere rise in wages, a mere increase of income, will not suffice permanently to raise the condition of the working classes and to reconcile them to their condition," yet there are hosts of so-called leaders who see nothing beyond this. They are asking for nothing but an increase of the comforts and conveniences of life. The hope of the future, for labor-

ing men, does not lay in an increase of profits and an equitable sharing of them. In a lecture delivered in Berlin and quoted in Luthardt's "Moral Truths of Christianity," page 377, occurs the following: "They think that the something else that is wanting is better education, more cultivation of the understanding, more intelligence, more knowledge, in short, to use the dying words of Goethe, more light. I say, on the contrary," continues the lecturer, "that highly as I appreciate the value of a more solid education of the working classes, it is not only more light that is wanted, but, above all, more love. Everything does not depend only upon enlightening the understanding but also upon warming the heart. It is in the fact that love of many has waxed cold, and that a blind and inordinate selfishness which alienates man from man has taken its place, that I behold the main root of the terrible discord which has attacked society and threatens its dissolution. More love, however, can only arise from drawing more deeply from the source of all love, from a renovation and revival of the Christian consciousness." Failing to grasp these great moral ideas, which are ever uppermost in the teaching of the Church, there has arisen a brood of issues which are wholly destructive. Riot, dynamite, anarchy and confusion are the watchwords of those who have fallen away from the beneficent influences of the Gospel. Before such wreckless and unreasoning masses every institution, human and divine, will be shattered to pieces, with the heartless indifference with which an angry sea, deaf to the entreaties of suffering humanity, engulfs a ship of the line crowded with human freight. The family bond becomes a convenience that can be snapped asunder at the fancy of either party to the union. All states and governments are looked upon as "conspiracies of the rich to promote their private interests and to plunder the poor under the mask of the common good." Religion is confounded with priestcraft and hypocrisy, and unreason is enthroned in the human heart, as surely as in the days of the Revolution it was upon the altar of Notre Dame, personated by a fallen woman. Communism becomes rife in every circle and declares that religion should be done away with, that the family and home life are

open questions, and that a prevalence of the community of goods should be brought about by the peaceful means of persuasion. If this end cannot be reached in a peaceful way, they quote the language of Kingley as their own: "No human power ever beat back a resolute forlorn hope; to be got rid of they must be beaten back with grape and canister;" and thus the peace and the good will of the Gospel is unheard; the teachings of the beloved Saviour are forgotten, and men are grasping each other at the throat with intent to kill.

Another grievous error of the working man is to yield obedience to that godless philosophy that has been popularized in so many ways. No one can listen to any of the language of the labor agitators, without feeling that the pabulum of their thought has been the materialistic sociology of Spencer and Darwin. "It is impossible to understand by what strange blindness socialists adopt Darwinian theories, which condemn their claims of equality, while at the same time they reject Christianity, whence these claims have issued and whence their justification can be found." (Lareleye's *Socialism of To-day*, page 20.)

It is only akin with the unreasonableness which marks so much of the labor agitation of to-day. Any one conversant with the highest needs of the human heart must see that home and state and church form a trinity of divine establishments, absolutely essential to the completion of the individual life. These great forces, like air and sunlight and water, are as necessary for the poor as for the rich, and the disintegrating powers arrayed against one or all of them, whether plated with gold or wrapped in rags, are the common enemy of man. A philosophy which, by the most liberal construction, encourages such opposition to the things that are unmistakably necessary cometh not from above, but is from beneath and is sensual, earthly and devilish.

Another grievous fault of the laboring classes is that they have not always recognized their real friends. If a man had any connection with the Church or State they have oftentimes concluded, without any further parleyings, that he must be hostile to the interests of their class. The Church as such has always been

the best friend of the laboring man. Through its teachings and example, it has lifted labor out of the low estate in which it was in the ancient world. Aristotle says all common labor and trading in the life of a citizen are incompatible with political virtue and prosperity. (Luthart, page 372.) For such a life is ignoble. None of the employments carried on by the multitude of artisans, dealers and hirelings, require or excite any moral power. Cicero says: Base and ignoble is also the business of the day laborer. Artisans, too, practise a mean employment, for the workshop implies nothing noble. The Church comes putting an ennobling element into the humblest labor. The 30 years spent in the humble carpenter shop at Nazareth has done more to sanctify the callings of life which require brain and muscle than all the philosophies of ancient and modern times. The Apostles remind the churches that to work is honorable, and if a man shall neglect the demands of industry and trade he shall be counted as a heathen. It was the Church that lifted laborers out of bondage and gave them the rights they now enjoy. Lecky says: (Hist. of Rationalism, page 23) "The Church, which often seemed so haughty and so overbearing in its dealings with kings and nobles, never failed to listen to the poor and to the oppressed, and for many centuries their protection was the foremost of all the objects of its policy." Yet so long as the old antipathy to labor continued, nothing of any lasting value had been effected. But here again the influence of the Church was exerted with unwavering beneficence and success. The Fathers employed all their eloquence in favor of labor.

By this means the contempt of labor was removed and the long concourse of evils which followed in the wake of slavery of the ancient world. "They knew," says Mr. Mill, speaking of the Benedictines, "and taught that temporal work may be a spiritual exercise, and, protected by their sacred character from depredation, they set the first example to Europe of industry conducted on a large scale by free labor." With such a record in favor of honest toil, and the sanctity of it as a moral exercise, established by the doctrine of divine grace, the Church should receive always

a hearty welcome from the laboring classes. She has been a mother to every effort that ennobled human nature, and has nourished every movement which had for its immediate or ultimate aim the amelioration of mankind. It is when driven almost to despair that Charles Kingsley speaks of this painful misunderstanding: "It seemed to me intolerable to be so misunderstood. It had been long intolerable to me to be regarded as an object of mistrust and aversion by thousands of my countrymen, my equals in privilege and too often, alas, far my superiors in practice, just because I was a clergyman, the very office which ought to have testified above all others for liberty, equality, brotherhood, for time and eternity. * * * I would shed the last drop of my life blood for the social and political emancipation of the people of England, as God is my witness; and here are the very men for whom I would die fancying me an aristocrat." The Church might adopt these burning words as her own, only in a far higher and more perfect sense, and hurl them against the great mass of laboring men, who look with suspicious glance upon every effort put forth to interfere with the confusion introduced by unreasoning demagogues.

But has not the Church failed also to properly interfere when the hand of the oppressor has been raised to smite the weaker vessel crouching before him? Some of the earlier Fathers used language which smacks very much of revolution. St. Basil said the rich man is a thief. St. Chrysostom said the rich are robbers; a kind of equality must be effected by making gifts out of their abundance. Better all things were in common. St. Jerome said opulence is always the product of a theft committed, if not by the actual possessor, by his ancestors. St. Ambrose said, Nature created community; private property is the offspring of usurpation. St. Clement said, In strict justice, everything should belong to all. Iniquity alone has created private property. Sentiments like these would sound more at home in a gathering of advanced socialists than in one of the comfortable churches up town in a commercial metropolis, and do they not conform more nearly with the teachings of Christ and his Apostles than the

platitudes with which we entertain a bevy of millionaires, glad to rest awhile in the church, free from the awful strain of the business of the week?

The Church has not insisted upon the stewardship which men have over the wealth entrusted to them. What right, human or divine, has a man of fortune to spend that money in luxury and ease when it is being increased at the expense of the heart's life of his employees? Is wealth a gift of God to be used and not abused as well as the talent with which he is endowed? To possess the power which wealth gives, and then use it to burden those who do not possess such power, is diabolical. The Church has not been diligent in setting forth this phase of the Gospel. It is the lack of devotion to this great truth which roused all the combative nature of Kingsley, Maurice and Thomas Carlyle to warn the English nation against that discrimination which puts the poor at a disadvantage. It seemed as if an Isaiah or Jeremiah had come back again to espouse the cause of the poor. Such advocacy kept Kingsley from preferment and finally helped to put Maurice out of a position which he was well able to fill. The Church of England lent but a half-hearing to these earnest preachers. It seemed as if Mammon had assumed the character of Moloch; as if his priests and many of their aides grew fat and wealthy at the cost of crowds of victims who were immolated before his shrine? Alton Locke and Yeast came like the mutterings of a pent-up wrath. The sermons from the Eversley Church were all tintured with that fervor which grew in the mind and heart of its noble rector when he said: I am a Chartist. Selfishness and greed and competition have become the controlling elements in business. Bread and meat are the whirligigs with which speculators trifle and play, while children starve and sturdy sons of toil are breaking beneath the burdens which are of necessity imposed upon them. These men are nearly all connected with the Church, or their families are. They are founding universities and seminaries, and the highest judicatories of the Church pronounce benedictions upon their foundations and ask a special blessing upon the donors. Their busts are placed

in the main halls, and their pictures occupy a place which attracts the attention of every visitor. Many of these dollars in the sight of God have blood stains upon them, and the beams of the buildings constructed by such influences will cry out one to the other. How seldom the Church lifts her voice against luxury and ease and comfort, or if the voice is lifted against such a course of life it receives but a small response from the hearers.

The poor man witnesses such kid glove handling of the peculiar vices of the rich. His own mistakes and shortcomings are the themes upon which clergymen in all pulpits expatiate; but the peculiar vices to which the rich are heir to are seldom brought out. "Plate sin with gold, and the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks; arm it with rags and a pigmy's straw doth pierce it." The Church is surely not for the poor man, else it would always remain with him. It is one of the anomalies of American cities that churches have "flitting days." The churches follow the crowds of respectable and well-to-do people. Up town the well-to-do people go, who can come to work in the morning when they please, or whose wives can go to market in their carriages. The large crowd of men who can not afford to pay car fare and who are compelled to be at work promptly early in the morning must live in the lower sections of the city. Churches go up town, but chapels are built down town. Preachers who stand at the head of the list are found in up-town churches. All the accompaniments of comfortable Christian worship will be found in up-town churches. Occasionally a man of exceptionable piety and ability relinquishes one of these spiritual palaces, and gives proof to the world that unto the poor the Gospel must be preached as an evidence of the Saviour's presence and power in the world. In all well-to-do parts of our cities there will be found churches and churches. In the city of my adoption there are nine churches so situated that a young Bethlehem shepherd, with a stone from his sling, might strike steeples of all or nearly all from one given point. Around them cluster magnificent houses, palatial residences. The city has expended lavishly, upon the squares and streets, in close proximity to the highly favored region. In other

sections of the city, where no such outward elegance displays itself, there are squares upon squares where the shadow of a chapel does not fall, and where ministers' calls are like angels' visits, not only because they are few and far between, but because they bring so much light and joy. The work of the Evangelical Alliance has been vigorously prosecuted in the region where churches are so thick as to interfere with each other's locomotion, like cabs on a crowded thoroughfare. But when a line of the city is reached, where the poor and unchurched live, the work stops. The rich or middle well-to-do classes have been visited by earnest Christian people, but where the less favored live the work has languished. Just where the churches have gone, there this effort, the end of which was especially to reach those who had no church relations, has been eminently successful. Where the churches used to be, and where crowds of men gather together who cannot find much light in the dark alleys and courts in which they live, men and women even charged with a piety above the common level cannot be induced to go. Occasionally there are exceptions to this statement, but in general the facts brought before me as one of the officers of the Evangelical Alliance of Baltimore establish the truth of the assertion.

In public meetings where this special kind of general church work is mapped out, it is generally done by the hand of an up-town pastor, who dances to the tune of \$5,000 a year, or somewhere near that. He lays down the plans by which the poor can be reached, and with all his energy urges upon the scattered pastors, in thickly settled districts, the necessity for more consecrated work. The papers, which too often, alas! are the poor man's bible, are crowded with accounts of magnificent offerings, the improvements, the vacations and the special honors lavished upon up-town ministers and churches. The impressions gathered are, that these are the highly favored; these are places where the special manifestations of divine favor are enjoyed; here is where men are sitting in heavenly places.

These are the simple facts staring the wage earner in the face every day. Unconsciously he falls into such a position that

he fears even these Greeks offering gifts. He gets the idea burned into his mind and heart that the Gospel that comes to him is through the favor of some others, who dole it out to him as a charity. It is the churches which are thus highly favored, so far as the world's goods are concerned, which are recognized on all occasions. The rich man's pastor is favored in Presbyteries, Classes and Synods. This does not come accidentally, or providentially. It does not result from mental or spiritual superiority. It comes from the plain unvarnished fact that the congregation over which he presides contributes most to the different Boards of the Church. The Church itself is courted and fawned upon, not because its membership is noted for piety and zeal in the Lord's work, but simply on account of worldly influence and wealth. What would St. James say were he to witness these things for a moment? What would the Saviour say if He were to walk and talk with us as in the days of His flesh? A poor unlettered lad could not be made to understand by a good meaning woman, very highly favored and well clad, that he should say our Father. He could say my Father and your Father, but he could not see how one Father could be the governor of two persons, whose conditions in life were so widely separated. It may be a current story without a foundation that a minister called from one of the less favored churches to a higher could not use his old sermons. The truth did not suit so well. Emerson said sadly: "The power of love as the basis of a state has never been tried." May not one who is not a prophet or the son of a prophet say the same thing of the Church? The problem of the Church is to make that divine love manifested in Jesus Christ the basis of all its movements; and then transform the state by introducing the same soothing power into all governmental relations.

Another great fact which the Church has not yet realized is that she has to do with all the concerns of life. Virgil says: "The philosophers are physicians who heal only the great and rich. Plato, who must, however, by no means be depreciated, is read only by men of science and education." But when

Christ came He sought to gain all, and Paul says, becoming all things to all men with the hope of saving some at least. The Church is terribly interested in the philosophical speculations of these later days. The minister is expected to be abreast with the times, by which is always meant an acquaintance with the latest book which in any way has affected the thinking of the day. This brought to ever so high a state of perfection will not soothe the pathway of the poor and heavy laden. The Gospel after which he longs, and which he needs most, touches his life at the point where it is blistered and bruised, in a hand-to-hand conflict with the hard facts of everyday life. Maurice has well said the religion of to-day has no hold upon human life in any of its forms. It treats politics, science, literature as secular; but it dabbles with them, pretends to reform them by mixing a few curt phrases with them, is really affected by all the worst habits which the most vulgar and frivolous pursuit of them engenders.

It trembles at every social movement, at every thought which is awakened in human hearts, at every discovery that is made in the world without. The wants of the poor might easily be satisfied from the extravagances of rich; the spiritual wants might be satisfied from the wasted energies of Christendom. As long as the State must provide for the education of the children, build almshouses for the poor and helpless, asylums for the sick and lame, and halt and blind; as long as Young Men's Christian Associations must be carried forward separate and apart from the churches, to provide a home for the stranger in a strange land; so long as the oppressed laborer must appeal to public sentiment for a redress of his wrongs, the Church has not reached the high-water mark of its privileges. The bakers of Brooklyn and New York, a short time ago sent out 600 circulars to clergymen, pleading with them to aid in securing relief from labor on the Sabbath day; they begged for a response. To these 600 pleadings they received a response from 25 preachers. It will be a rather difficult task to convince these men, in the coming days, that the Church has anything practically to do with the every day life of a working man, when through its representatives it does not

seem to have much to do with his Sunday life. It will not satisfy the honest questionings of struggling men to say that the Church creates a public sentiment and this in the end accrues to the welfare of the oppressed. Public sentiment does not possess requisite thickness to plaster bruised and bleeding hearts, groaning under real or even imaginary wrongs. It is too insubstantial to deliver from a burden that is crushing out all the better elements of human life. *Must* there be a dualistic conflict here as marked as that which existed between light and darkness in Parsee religion? Will we ever realize that glad time when it is promised that the rich and the poor shall sit down together and show that the Lord is the maker of them all? The breach can be removed. The alienations can be broken. The chasms can be bridged. But relief must come from those in power, and the end of the Church should be to enlist it in the interests of the weaker.

(1) THE CHURCH MUST RECOGNIZE THE ACTUAL STATE
OF THE CASE.

It will not do to pass it by as the priest or the Levite. Suffering men are bleeding and dying by the wayside, having fallen into the hands of thieves and robbers. "There is, notwithstanding all human endeavors on the part of individual employers, and the heroic exertions after frugal self-help on that of many workmen, a consumption of men in favor of capital—a consumption which, by wearing out the vital strength of individuals, by enfeebling whole generations, by breaking up families, by letting men run morally wild, and by its destruction of all alacrity in labor, endangers in the highest degree the state of civilized society."

If statesmen and social reformers look these questions squarely in the face, and realize their terrible significance, is it too much to expect the Church to hasten into the forefront of that battle that looks to their solution? Modern times have placed in the hands of the "so-called working classes powerful weapons. Men in possession of universal suffrage, corporate rights and liberty of coalition are not to be trifled with and can not be put down at a word." The Church must come upon them with more powerful

influence, or these things will be a savor of death unto death for them. If once it is felt everywhere, by friend and foe, that the Church has really grasped the problem, there will be a long step gained toward its solution. Then her voice, which now is but the piping of a lute in a thunderstorm, will come with the majesty of that word which spoke out of the midst of the cloud-capped and thunder-riven mountain of the desert. There will then be a majesty in her voice, not dependent upon the uncertainties of Apostolic succession, or upon the somewhat misty speculations of a dogmatician, but upon its own power. Men, however indifferent, will say it is the voice of God. If there be no recognition of the problem, men will not stay to treat with us or to listen to us. Men do not care what commentators say about the justice of God in afflicting Job or putting a thorn in the flesh of Saul. The only thing they ask at the first when the Church comes to them is, Do you know that there is a conflict, a conflict which means war to the knife, and which must end in the complete destruction of one or the other parties, unless grievous wrongs are righted? After such recognition there will be a willingness patiently to listen to any amount of argument as to the causes which have produced this unfortunate state of affairs. Then they will give the most earnest heed to any suggestions that are made looking to the alleviation of their sufferings. It is a fact patent to all that the Church has not awakened to the clash of the conflict which already surges round our very doors.

(2) THE CHURCH MUST PREACH THE WHOLE TRUTH
TO ALL ALIKE.

Christianity has not lost its power, and the Church has not given over its control to any other establishment, sacred or profane. It is to-day a witness that a divine ruler is over all; that there is a gracious government which extends to all creatures that dwell on the earth; that God is King over all, and that governments and organizations, however formidable, are but eddies in the stream of time, unless they subserve the purpose of eternal justice. It has been charged as cringing at the feet of the great and wealthy; of

trampling upon the poor; of fancying that her strength lay in her revenues. This temptation is always present, and we are making pages of Church history which will require a good deal more to be read between the lines than is written out in bold hand to keep our successors from blaming us with this grievous sin: The Church "is bound to feel that she is set in the high places and has a voice to reach all classes of society, not that she may utter cant phrases about religion and the Church in the ears of those who think that these phrases signify maintenance of their possession by what are called religious sanction; but to tell all by words and action that they exist in their different relation as servants one of another in His immediate presence, under His awful eye, who became the servant of all and died for all." (Maurice Patriarch, etc., page 23.) Such a mission appeals at once to all the manliness of human nature. A voice like this would strike dumb the wildest passions of the mob, like the soldiers before the majestic *I am He*, at the entrance of Gethsemane. Paul had a word for the servants, and he spoke it out fearlessly and manfully. He had no time to reconcile the foolish questionings that sprung up in the heart, longing for that freedom which these latter civilizations have made the common inheritance of the earth. The servants were commanded to be obedient to the masters who were placed over them. The obedience was to be that which children render to parents. With the same unquestioning diligence, they were to pursue their calling and listen to no voice which in any way would interfere with their ultimate completion of the task of life. But with the same note of inspiration he preached to the masters. He gave to them a warning which, if properly heeded, would stay every arm uplifted to strike a slave, and paralyze every foot raised to be set upon the neck of a prostrate fellow man. Man's inhumanity to man, which has made countless thousands mourn, would be banished from the earth, if the political economy of the New Testament would be introduced into the social relation of life.

These great truths are for all. Unrighteous dealing must be heroically rebuked and the hot burning waves of divine wrath

must be hurled against them with the indignation of a John the Baptist. Legislatures have busied themselves in finding pet phrases with which to shield the most unrighteous transaction. Gambling in high places, though at the expense of the poor man's bread and meat, has been encouraged in States professedly Christian. Courts of justice have lent a helping hand to shield these criminal procedures when an outraged public has risen up against them. The voice of the Church has been dumb. These same crimes committed by any of the great unwashed throng would have landed the perpetrators behind the bars. Gambling, fraud, trickery can not be made respectable by legislative enactment or encouragement. Fine phrases made current in respectable society can never make the crime of the poor man the virtue of the wealthy. Here is a great field for the Church and its borders are greatly extended by every new advance in our civilization. It will be the practiced eye of those who have been much with Jesus and have been permeated by His teachings that will discern these things. In looking at the increase of our wealth, the growth of our cities, the lengthening of our railroads and the magnificence of our commerce, we exclaim, Master what great stones are here. But what are all these when the spirit of righteousness has gone out. The burning words of Jeremiah must be spoken to-day as never before. "Execute ye judgment and righteousness and deliver the spoiled out of the hands of the oppressors and do no wrong, do no violence to the stranger, the fatherless nor the widow, neither shed innocent blood in this place. Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness and his chambers by wrong, that useth his neighbor's service without wages and giveth him not for his work, that saith I will build me a wide house and well-aired chambers (a country residence) and cutteth him out windows, and it is ceiled with cedar and painted with vermilion." The earnest proclamation of such truths by a messenger well accounted of God would not be palatable. It would shake many of these fortunes to pieces and drive their possessors entirely beyond the pale of the Church. The Church of the future will not be that with a glorious history in

the past, not that which will compromise with the world for the sake of revenue and numbers, but that which can speak the whole truth without a stammer.

(3) THE CHURCH MUST BE OPEN TO ALL ALIKE.

The church is God's house. He has made of one blood all nations that dwell upon the face of the earth. It must be open to all. This truth is gradually dawning upon the minds of the people. It has dawned upon the wage earners long ago. They could not meet the demands made upon them, and they have withdrawn. They have been put out. They have found no place in the house of God. One of the abominations of modern times encouraging this state of affairs is the pew system. This never could have been hatched in the brain of a true Christian spirit. It was born of the Devil, and to the Devil it ought to go. It has been a murderer from the day of its birth. Dr. Pierson says, "In my judgment, the present pew system is the most monstrous barrier that has ever been erected between the churches and the common people." Words akin to these were uttered lately in one of the most intellectual pulpits, and to one of the richest churches in New York. Every day that this is allowed to continue the chasm between the Church and the masses will widen.

It is not merely the fact that pews are rented, but that such a spirit is in the Church. There might be free pews and still the same spirit of exclusiveness, the same sense of superiority. Men cannot hide it simply by opening all the pews to those who come. We sometimes hear it said that the rich and the poor will not sit down together and should not be expected to do so. If such is the conclusion forced upon us by the constitution of modern society, then the ultimate triumphs of Christianity can never be hoped for. If in God's house men can not sit down with their fellows, since custom has put up a barrier which the abounding love of Jesus Christ cannot break down, then farewell to some of the proudest expectations that have cheered the Christian toilers of the past. If a genuinely Christian sentiment possessed by one of the highly favored of the earth cannot meet a like senti-

ment in the heart of the humblest of God's creatures, and both not feel the nearer heaven since it has been there, then a time when the Church shall be without spot or wrinkle or any such thing will never come. That eighteen centuries of Christianity have not realized the divine ideal is patent to a passing observer; that it will not break every barrier down and bring us to see face to face together, and lift up the voice to praise the same common Saviour, from the same building, yea, from the same pew, I cannot believe. Somewhere along the line of Christian history self-interest will become hideous and hateful, and it will be acknowledged that "self-sacrifice is the only law upon which human society can be grounded with any hope of success."—Kingsley. •

There are likewise certain facts that must be honestly apprehended and openly acknowledged by the laboring classes.

(1) THERE IS NO DELIVERANCE IN SIMPLE ANARCHY.

In every great historic upheaval there must be a greater end to be subserved and reached. To see the present breaking up, without a reasonable prospect of a new dawn, is recklessness without excuse. Herr Most is not a historic figure.

No man is great when tearing down simply. It might be that out of a wrecked and broken society a new æon of human history could be evolved under the divine guidance of Him who is mightier than the noise of many waters, yea, than the mighty waves of the sea, but such is not the general order of providence in history. Any movement with a probability of reaching a better stage of developement must grow out of the forces of the past. These have been secured under the immediate guidance of God and can no more be ruthlessly disregarded than the ancestry of a man whose character is to bring a new hope to his fellow travelers. The greater part of the social movement of the present time has but one watch word. Down with every power in state or family which is in any way the embodiment of authority. The sword of justice is unsheathed in vain before a populace under the inspiration of such unreasonable motives. That there must come a crashing of the ploughshare of enlightened

•

Christian sentiment into the stubborn glebe and fallow ground of customs, beaten hopelessly hard by greed and gain is acknowledged by all. Such a breaking up of the fallow ground that the good seed may be profitably cast in will never be attained under the guidance of unreasoning madness. In its rage anarchy has lifted its hand against every pillar of human society. It must learn that the family is sacred, and the hand withered by gaunt famine even must expect the fate of Uzzah if it be lifted against it. It must learn that the state is still the child of God, though legislation and government may be sluggish in redressing the wrongs which threaten the whole life of men; and organized opposition, though ever so formidable, must expect the fate of Sennacherib if it hurl itself against this anointed of God. Organization is praiseworthy. Every effort inspired by Christian manhood should be put forth to have a fair hearing at the seat of government. Money and men should be sacrificed as a turning point in battle till the better day dawns. The cause is just and should not plead in vain. The wrongs can and will be redressed. Strikes even may be justified by the best and enlightened community. There may be a long, long wail of howling, O Lord, how long, without any marked redress. But all this does not justify the Haymarket murders or Trafalger Square riots. Dynamite, fire and bullets in the hands of an unreasoning mob are sorry elements out of which to reconstruct society.

(2) THE LABORING CLASSES MUST RECOGNIZE THE TRUE
OBJECT OF THE CHURCH AND THE ENDS IT CAN
REASONABLY BE EXPECTED TO ATTAIN.

Nothing is more unfortunate than the relative position from which the laboring classes have looked upon the Church. It looks to be the incarnation of priesthood and prelacy. It is forgotten that the swaddling clothes of mediæval scholasticism have been cast aside. The cruelties of the inquisition, the bans put upon the righteous acquisition of knowledge, and the entire subservience of every movement of the proletariat, to the control of the priesthood, are not the common experiences of the XIX cen-

tury. The philosophy which has become the stock in trade of the labor agitators, or I should rather say the philosophers, have made a like mistake. Buckle, and Draper especially, in his *Conflict of Science with Religion*, have failed to separate the Church of the present from the excrescences of the Middle Ages, and have failed to distinguish between religion and the partial embodiment of it in the modern Church even. If these intellectual savants are so blinded that they can not see, wherewithal shall the great commonality which must be led appear.

The Church can never use weapons which do not belong to her. The sword is born in vain when held by the hand of an ecclesiastic. Put up thy sword must ever be the impressive word, sounding in the ears of the Church; when she is tempted to resort to force, even to redress the most grievous wrongs. Not by might nor by power, but by my spirit saith the Lord of hosts. The world does not need warriors as much as statesmen. It will be a glad day when men shall cease to be guided by the grim visaged god of war and shall follow with implicit confidence the star of Bethlehem. Prophets and lawgivers have done far more for the emancipation of the human mind and for the advance of the millennium than the sturdiest warriors whether in ancient or modern times. It is unreasonable then to demand the use of weapons of war by the Church, to lift the suffering laborers out of the oppression that burdens them. It was a lawgiver that brought the children of Israel up out of Egyptian bondage. Though occasionally compelled to bear the sword, yet the greater portion of his life was spent in giving laws and establishing the foundations of the sacred commonwealth. It must be the same now. Socialism has not one single principle entitling it to respect and giving it some hope for the future which does not trace its genealogy back to the influence of Christianity. "The very ideas which have become the inspiration of socialism have been born and baptized at the Christian altar." It is from the apostles of Jesus Christ that the great inspirations have come which have thus far removed the shackles which hold in check the full freedom of man. Ideas are mightier than arms. Bullets

are not a match for mind. Now it belongs to the Church to give birth to the new ideas of righteousness. "The ministers of Christianity are not dynamite and the rifle, but truth and love incarnate in living men." The wage earner must learn this; unless he does, there will follow fast and follow faster confusion worse confounded. The hand of every man will be against his brother, anarchy will spread its sooty wings over smiling homes and prosperous commonwealths, leaving in its shadow desolation and death, compared with which Sahara would be a pleasant dwelling place. The rose garden will be turned into a desert, and the stirring music of busy labor will sound as hoarse as a funeral knell and finally die away as the reflux wave of the sea.

(3) RELIGION IS THE STARTING POINT FOR EVERY STRUGGLE
TOWARDS FREEDOM.

It is curious to notice how this chief factor has been relegated to the shades of forgetfulness. Bishop Butler's words describing the social status of religion at the close of the last century may be used with terrible truthfulness about the laboring classes: "It has come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry, but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious, and accordingly they treat it as if in the present age this were an agreed point among all persons of discernment, and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were, by way of reprisals for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world." Such sentiments must enervate any real heart in a movement carried forward among workingmen. It robs it of all that is worth contending for. A house without a foundation or a tree without a tap root would not be more grievous anomalies than a real movement among men without religion. To throw it overboard at the start, is simply to invite disaster. Heaven is not the resting place of the saints because it has golden streets and pearly gates, and gardens and fields, with never-failing streams, and shaded by trees that bear twelve kinds of fruit and give twelve crops in a year.* It is the longed-for and blessed

hope of the saints, because it actualizes the largest ideas of fatherhood and brotherhood. The sons of God there are like God; and the brotherhood of Christ and His followers is perfected peace. The ideal of society should not be that every man should be a Croesus, and that every field should be made to produce an hundredfold. When ideas like these possess the mind of an agitator there is a loud cry for division of property, nationalization of land, sharing of profits with the idle and improvident, and a whole catalogue of theories that promote restlessness and discontent. The aim of the Church must be to actualize the larger amount of fatherhood and brotherhood. Its doctrines must promote a healthier state among men of these great facts; incarnating God and His Son Jesus Christ in the minds and lives of men. Workmen are unreasonable when they disregard her efforts along this line. With all her apparent and real indifference, she has started a stream of beneficence which will finally make every man a brother and unite us together in bonds over which the Father of all will pronounce His choicest benediction.

No solution of this great question is possible without a large element of religion entering into it. No magisterial interference of the state can quell the turbulent stream which, already freighted with some of the most darling interests of humanity, threatens to rush into rapids and down over the falls. It must not be that the vox populi becomes the vox Dei, but that the vox Dei becomes the vox populi. The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Father and of His Christ. This ultimate triumph, which is coördinate with the ultimate triumphs of man, will never be reached till perfect submission shall be secured to the only Potentate and Power whose right it is to command all. He that should dare in any way to interfere with this ultimate triumph, enlisting all the forces and energies of heaven, must in that degree find his name fading from the pages of the Book of Life and in the end have it blotted out altogether. In the wake of his efforts will follow all the plagues that have been threatened against those who dare to add anything to the chart of human redemption, drawn by the steady hand of Him who walketh amid

the flaming splendors of the golden candlestick and whose will it is to dash in pieces like a potter's vessel those who imagine a vain thing or rage against His holy purposes. The most gigantic combinations must feel in the end the burning of His wrath and scorn when they are kindled but a little when planted in the way along which His purposes are moving to ultimate triumph. When the wage earners, who form such a predominant constituency, not only of the brawn and muscle, but of the mind and heart of these modern nations, shall have thoroughly realized that the chief corner stone of every permanency is Jesus Christ and His word, and then work along such lines as this enlightened faith will designate, the shackles will begin to fall from labor's blistered hands and feet and the wealth of the world will be glad to be the servant instead of the master. Then the hoarse and ominous cry from employees and employers saying, "All thine is mine," shall be changed into a sweet, sympathetic service and sacrifice, which will say, "All mine is thine."

IV.

THE CHURCH AND THE CHILDREN.

BY REV. S. Z. BEAM, D. D.

The Church has in many respects lost its hold upon the children, in consequence of which they grow up largely independent of its influence. This lamentable fact necessitates the inauguration of extraordinary measures and special efforts to gather in and interest young men and women in religious matters. All this unprecedented agitation regarding the Sunday-school and Young People's Societies is a tacit and, perhaps, unconscious recognition of the widespread falling away of the children of Christian parents from their rightful position in the covenant of grace.

We do not, in this paper, propose to find fault with the Sunday-school or with Young People's Societies. We are glad that these efforts to reclaim our children are pressed so vigorously. But we deplore the state of affairs in the Church which necessitates them, especially as applied to our own Church, which still glories in the time-honored educational system of religion which these measures are intended to replace. We propose, however, to institute an inquiry into the causes which have brought us into this condition.

Our theory has always regarded the children of Christian parents as members of the household of faith, and entitled to the initiatory rite of holy baptism, whereby they "are admitted into the Christian Church and distinguished from the children of infidels" (Heid. Cat. Quest., 71). As members of the congregation, and having the seal of Christ set on them, which is a sure sign and pledge of their having been "washed by the blood and spirit of Christ from all the pollution of their souls, that is, from all their sins" (Heid. Cat. Q., 69), they are to be nurtured in the Lord (Eph. 6: 4), and thereby prepared to "ratify and

confirm the promise made in their name at their baptism and acknowledge themselves bound to believe and do all those things which their parents undertook for them (Directory Worship, page 115). This last is, of course, to take place after they have been properly instructed," when the Church bestows upon them the blessing of confirmation by prayer and the laying on of hands (Direct. of Wor., pg. 114).

At the time of their baptism the parents or guardians are solemnly reminded of their "duty to train them up, by precept or example, in the true knowledge and fear of God according to the articles of the Christian faith and doctrine, as contained in the Old and New Testaments and in the symbols of the Church," that is, the Catechism, the Directory of Worship, the Hymn Book and the Constitution. They must "especially be reminded often of their baptismal vows and obligations, and be taught the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed and the Ten Commandments; and finally they must be brought to the minister to be instructed in the Catechism, etc., etc." (Direct. of Wor. pg. 107.) A faithful discharge of these duties is incumbent upon the parents. The minister and pastor of the congregation is also under solemn obligation, as the guide of his people, to be diligent in enforcing by his own example, and by his personal teaching, all these parental obligations. When all these obligations are squarely met and faithfully discharged, in the fear of God and the love of Christ, there need be little fear as to the result. Results are with God, and we may be sure that the children, as a rule, will grow up in the Church, as nurtured in the Lord; and no sensational measures or extraordinary efforts will be needed to hold them in the Church. They will neither go back to the world nor wander like lost sheep from one church to another, or from one pasture to another. There are exceptions, indeed, but the rule still holds good.

This is the theory, and in former days was the practice of the Reformed Church.

But now we are confronted with another system as several sister Churches are. Why is this so?

Is it not because we have largely fallen away from the Scriptural and honored system of our fathers? Have we not been captured and misled by the noisy and showy methods of others, who belittle the divine character of the Church, regarding it only as a society, and its means of grace as badges and empty signs of blessings, which must be received independently of their use? Have we not been deceived by the blare of trumpets, the rapid progress and the growing numbers of those who could not endure the slow-going movements which characterized our system?

For a long time we withstood this outside pressure, but have now, to a large extent, given way to its influence, and as a result, we have lost our hold upon many of our children. They go to other churches, or no church, as the fancy takes them, or at best are held by a weak and unreliable tie.

We may add here with equal truth that all the Churches are experiencing a similar state of looseness among their young people, which requires the new methods now in use in order to hold them together. Thus the bond of church-fellowship must be supplemented and strengthened by a new pledge, binding them to the church through the mediation of the society.

Now if we inquire for the causes of such declension, we must go back to a former period in history, not perhaps, beyond the Reformation, but certainly to the beginnings of Protestantism. At that age the spirit of religious freedom was carried by some beyond its normal limits and landed them in infidelity and licentiousness. But leaving this extreme departure from the truth of religious freedom aside, we discern in the baptistic independency of that age a force, which unconsciously to its devotees has worked itself out to a conclusion which we now see and lament. And though this abnormal abuse of freedom was repudiated by Reformed and Lutheran peoples with emphasis, yet it has pertinaciously pressed itself forward till it has actually infected all branches of Protestantism with its virus. We may add here too that the rationalistic tendency of many of the higher critics has lent itself to the propagation of unchurchliness and has aided consciously or unconsciously in degrading the supernatural char-

acter of the divine ordinances. Hence we believe that the evils complained of are rooted in a bygone age; and though it may be said that they are the result of the spirit of the present age, this is only true because the present is the outgrowth of the past. Or, may we not say that these disintegrating elements have been evolved and exaggerated, as the conflict for religious freedom has been fought out? Possibly we might not go very far from the truth if we should call it the Anti-Christ of Protestantism. This may be regarded as a serious charge. But we may not forget that it is not the first time in history that the Church has been betrayed into serious heresy.

The particular thing to which we refer is the morbid independency which repudiates all authority, even that of the Bible itself, in those places which can not be interpreted to suit the system. This system, in one phase, is enslaved to a mode of baptism, yet it denies all divine efficacy in baptism, except in the case of the adult who submits to immersion, and in that case the grace of baptism is the fruit of faith; and even then baptism is only a useless appendage, added to the believer after his faith has saved him. Accordingly the right to this holy ordinance is denied to the infant children of Christian parents, because they are supposed to have no faith to give it efficacy. And on the same wrong principle, the whole educational system of religion is denounced as a relic of Romanism and an invention of the devil, while creeds are condemned as breeders of strife and schism.

According to this system, children of Christian parents from their infancy onward to their majority, are regarded as children of the devil, and left to the "uncovenanted mercies of God," until they can be arrested in their course of sin, and converted by special agencies invented for the purpose. The Scriptural doctrine that they are children of the covenant is repudiated as a popish error, and their baptism is intentionally omitted, on the plea that they cannot believe, and that therefore the divine ordinance is but an empty ceremony, carrying with it no promise and no grace. The divine covenant, it is alleged, does not include the children. They can not, therefore, enter into it until they are

old enough to do so by a conscious act of their own ; and so the covenant is degraded to the level of an agreement entered into by two parties, as if a man agrees to obey God's commands, on condition that He on His part will pay for the service. That God on His part made the covenant without the assistance of man, and included parents and their children together in its blessings, is a truth which is denied. And so, for this system, the covenant of God involves no act of grace for the Christian's child, until it is old enough to accept it by a conscious act of faith.

And then, that the child may not be biased in its choice, it must be permitted to grow up without any positive Christian training. From this standpoint the Church is only a society. Each congregation forms a church by itself. The members of it are united by a federal contract. Its strength and coherency depend, not so much on divine grace and ordinances, as on the will of the individuals who voluntarily unite with it. Thus the little children are left out in the cold to battle with the temptations of the world, without the safeguards which the covenant secures to their parents. They sustain no vital relation to the Church and have no interest in it. The Church, however, is not entirely oblivious to their interests. It is waiting till they are old enough to be saved ; and as soon as they are converted, and can show sufficient evidence of personal religious experience on the outside of the church, it is ready to receive them for safekeeping, and as a token of membership it bestows upon them the sign of immersion. No other sign is necessary, and no other is sufficient. Baptism has no connection with their regeneration, no relation to their independent experience, and nothing to do with their salvation. They must be saved first without baptism, and then baptism is vouchsafed after the approved mode, to mark them as the elect. This arraignment may be severe, but we believe it is true.

Children grown under such conditions have no relation to the Church, and naturally feel no interest in it. They are aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the covenants

of promise. If they are afterwards so happy as to be saved, it seems to be accomplished in spite of the Church. But really there can be little wonder if they care little for the Church and can be only drawn into it by special efforts inaugurated for the purpose, in order apparently to make amends for past neglect.

The introduction of Methodism about a century and a-half ago, while it did a good practical work and has become a mighty power in the United States, nevertheless gave renewed emphasis to what we have denominated this unchurchly tendency. It indeed accomplished much by way of arousing people from the lethargy of a dead formalism. It held on to the use of sprinkling as a proper mode of baptism, without excluding immersion, which, all intelligent Christians ought to admit, is also a proper mode; and besides it preserved infant baptism as an ordinance of the Church. But unfortunately it fell in with the Baptist theory of the meaninglessness of the Scriptural Church ordinances, and made a conscious personal experience of conversion, the *summum bonum* of the Christian profession, thereby setting aside the efficacy and all the meaning of holy baptism as a grace-bearing ordinance of God. It is preserved merely as a sign or badge of regeneration, but its sacramental character, as a seal and as a means, in the proper use of which the Holy Ghost confers regenerating grace, is lost sight of or intentionally denied. In like manner the catechization of the youth was dispensed with. This movement soon became popular, probably because it did away the drudgery of Christian and Churchly education, and made it easy to get religion, whether one had any intelligent idea of Christian doctrines or not. In fact in many instances preachers denounced such education as a hindrance rather than a help to the practice of true godliness. So that baptized children who grew up under the influence of the educational system, and whose religious life was dominated and controlled from infancy by Christian principles, which were unfolded in the form of Christian practice, were supposed not to be converted, and however consistently they adorned their profession of faith in Christ, if they could not tell how, when and where they were converted, and thus show what was

denominated, by way of preëminence, a "Christian experience," they were supposed to be yet in the "gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity." The work of the Holy Spirit in baptism counted for nothing. Catechization and a whole life of service in the Master's vineyard counted for nothing. But the "experience" of an hour or a day or a week was regarded as a better evidence of conversion and a surer passport at the gate of heaven. Thus was overlooked the *real experience* of doing the will of God, whereby one knows of the doctrine whether it be of God, and personal feeling became the test of religion.

The popularity of the new measures enabled their advocates to make inroads among the Churches whose educational systems were thought to have brought them into a state of dead formalism, and many "converts" from "formalism" to a "genuine experience" were gathered in. Here and there preachers in these churches caught the enthusiasm and introduced the new methods into their congregations, and in proportion to the success of these measures, catechization was dropped, baptism lost its meaning and was to some extent neglected, and the children were suffered to grow up in ignorance of Christian doctrines and duties, for want of parental training; and Reformed and Lutheran congregations, while retaining their old names, became practically Methodist. The baptized children grew up and were treated exactly like the unbaptized, and could only be received into the covenant after having passed the crisis of conversion, through which the baptized and unbaptized alike must pass in order to get religion. Thus baptism, Christian training and confirmation have lost all significance. Church membership by virtue of infant baptism was ignored. God's special promise to the children in the *Christian family*, when consecrated to Him in His own appointed way, is thus entirely ignored, and such children are treated as if they were heathen or infidel. "The promise to you and your children." Ministers who were converted to this system tried for a while to combine the two methods, with the result that eventually the new system prevailed. But even in some instances where catechization is still continued they are not

expected to receive the rite of confirmation until they are converted at a special series of meetings held for the purpose.

As a consequence of this falling away into such methods the pastor forgets to urge parents to train their children in the doctrines and duties of religion, and they are of course neglected. The time of life when children are most impressible and most susceptible to religious influences passes away without proper improvement. Their minds and hearts, like an uncultivated garden, which becomes infected with noxious weeds, are filled with unchurchly and irreligious ideas and emotions. If after years of such want of Christian training they are converted, it requires all the rest of their lives, even with the help of the Spirit and grace of God, to root out and destroy these hurtful influences.

Is it any wonder that the Church loses its hold on the children?

Still, happily, they are not wholly neglected. They must have some kind of a Christian education in all the Churches. The Sunday-school is employed, not to supplement home training, but as far as possible to supply the want of it. It takes the responsibility of teaching the Bible a half-hour on Sunday, to off-set the evil effects of parental neglect and the bad influences to which the child is subjected for the rest of the week. It is better to get that much religious instruction than none at all. Blessed are the officers and teachers in our Sunday-schools who have the grace and the good disposition to give their time and attention to this noble work. God will reward them for it, however little fruit of their labor they may be permitted to see in this world. Many are won and reclaimed for the Church through their instrumentality, but many others soon get too old for the Sunday-school, and go out to battle with the world at such great disadvantage that they are overcome by temptations and are lost. But even if they are fortunate enough to be reclaimed, there is no special bond by which they are held loyally to their Church. They have imbibed the idea that "one Church is as good as another," and it is easy to make a transition to some other Church or to the world, according to their fancy. When this state of affairs comes to

be recognized and to some extent comprehended, as it has already done, some means must be employed to hold them.

Now to keep any one out of mischief it is best to keep him employed. The best thing for young church members is to have something to do for Christ and the Church. But as many of our young people scarcely know what they can do for want of previous training, we have hit upon the plan of organizing them into societies in which each can be assigned to some duty, and thus find something to do "for Christ and the Church." Here some may receive some compensation for lack of proper training in childhood, while those who enjoyed better advantages can employ their gifts for further advancement in the divine life. Hence we may say that the Sunday-school and the Young People's Societies are educational and deserve to be aided and encouraged in their good work. Many have doubtless been saved through their instrumentality, and others have been kept loyal to their Church, who otherwise might have drifted away from one Church to another, having no permanent ecclesiastical home, or else out into the world and to perdition.

But even here positive Christian training is often neglected. The motto is "for Christ and the Church." But it is adopted in a general way. To some the Church is a sort of symbol for religion, and not a living organism composed of living congregations, of living families, of living individuals, all bound together by a living union with the person of Christ.

With this view of the Church the society seems to have the first claim on its members, and the congregation, of which it forms a part, is felt to be secondary. Here again the sacraments are ignored as of small account, and the personal testimony which each offers in the public meeting becomes the article of a standing or falling Christian life. With such testimony we have no fault to find. But we plead for pastors and consistories to guide the young people in their endeavors, and keep them by precept and example in touch with the Church and its ordinances. Their pledge, which is a good one, may be regarded as a partial explanation of the obligation which every member assumed at

his confirmation. The dangers to which these societies are exposed can be avoided if ministers and consistories will but take the oversight of the societies and direct their work in the proper channels. As matters now stand it is evident that in many congregations the Christian Endeavor, or some other society, has become a necessity. It has come to stay. It has done a great deal of good, not so much in its great conventions, as by its practical work in the individual congregations. In this way it can accomplish a great amount of good, especially when it reaches down to lift up the children of the Church and to lend a helping hand in training them for Christ and the Church.

In this way some compensation can be made for the sad neglect which these children suffer at home. And in this way the minister may find a means of gaining an influence over the children whom he fails to bring into the Catechetical class. A judicious control of the Junior Society will enable him to instruct its members in the doctrines of the Church, which under existing circumstances he has no other opportunity to do.

But at the same time that he fosters and leads his societies and inculcates true churchly principles, he cannot excuse himself from the duty of instructing parents in relation to their duties to their children. He must insist on their bringing their infants to him to receive the rite of holy baptism. He must urge them to train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord and bring them at the proper age to the pastor for Catechetical instruction, where they can be prepared for confirmation. If the children of the Reformed Church are to remain loyal to its customs and practices they must be properly nurtured in its churchly principles and as a part of the Christian family. Otherwise, like many others they will say, "One church is as good as another," which usually means to those who say it, that no Church is of much account. For whenever people resort to that excuse for forsaking their own Church for another, their life show sthat they have little or no loyalty to any Church.

While we feel constrained to believe that all Evangelical Churches are loyal to Christ and are doing a blessed work for

Him, yet we can not regard with indifference that independent spirit which justifies itself in its carelessness for its own Church by claiming an equal love for all. Every denomination is bound, in self-defense and for the sake of Christ, to inculcate a love for its own Church in every child.

Where this is done, and especially where the Reformed Church brings up its children in full harmony with its educational system, they usually feel under special obligations to their own denomination at large, and to their own congregation in particular, and at the same time they are liberal in their views of other sister Churches. But they will devote themselves to the interest and prosperity of their own Church in preference to all others.

What we need in the Reformed Church is not a repristination of former practices to the exclusion of all modern methods of Christian work, many of which have proven themselves valuable and helpful, but a simple return to a right apprehension and use of the divinely appointed means of grace. Infant baptism should everywhere be insisted on as a real institution of grace, as a means through which the Holy Spirit communicates the grace it represents, and as a fundamental article of our Christian faith. The child should then be treated as a child of God, as a member of the Church, a partaker of the covenant of grace, a citizen of the kingdom of grace, born into the kingdom by water and the Spirit.

Then let the parents be made fully to understand that Christ, through this holy ordinance, has received it, released it from sin, according to their prayer, and that He will sanctify it with the Holy Ghost and give it the kingdom of heaven and eternal life, according to His own promise, and that they are to keep and train it, not as a child of the world, or of Satan, but as it is in truth, a child of God, in the Christian family a true member of the household of faith, and under solemn vows and obligations to live an obedient life. Thus he will be taught to honor his profession by a holy life and conversation, realizing that his citizenship is in heaven, to the glory of God and the salvation of his soul. (*Direct. of Worship*, page 107.)

We are not forgetful of the fact that many children baptized in infancy disappoint the hopes of their parents, fail of the grace of God and grow up in sin. But this sad circumstance argues nothing against the efficacy of the sacrament or the Divine character of the Church, but is rather a misapprehension of the sacrament and a wrong conception of the Church. Faith in the sacrament sometimes degenerates into the superstition that baptism has an *ex opere operato*, or magic power inherent in itself, which is able to save the soul. In that case the child may be taught to rest in baptism as a sure pledge and seal of salvation without his own coöperation.

Or, fearing the fatal consequences of such error, there may be a falling away to the opposite extreme, in which baptism is robbed of all gracious contents. Which of these heresies is the worse we do not undertake to decide. But we feel quite confident that a child brought up under the influence of either extreme will at least suffer the consequence in after life if he is not led to a false trust on the one hand or infidelity on the other. It will be easy to see in either case that the object of holy baptism is defeated. In the one case God is supposed to save the subject of baptism without His own coöperation. In the other case God's part in the sacrament is practically denied, and some other means must be resorted to, to bring the person to Christ.

But when it is understood that God communicates through baptism His regenerating grace for the use of His child; and he is then taught by precept and example the duty of rightly using that grace, and of a participation in the divine ordinances of the Church, and growing up in the exercise of a godly life, we have God's promise for it that He will not depart from the path of rectitude. And when, under such influences, the child has reached the age of accountability he will be held to his Church, and through it to his Saviour, by a bond which can not be broken. And it is the opinion of the writer of this paper that if the Churches would return to this educational and Scriptural system, and carry it out faithfully, modified, perhaps, to suit the necessities of the times, the cry that "the Church is losing its hold on

the children" would cease. The blessings peculiarly vouchsafed to the Christian family, and through it to individual members, would be more highly appreciated and the children would enjoy its sanctifying influence, and be led to love and honor the faith of their parents, and cling to their Church with child-like confidence and unwavering faith.

V.

THE RELATION OF THE CLASSES IN SOCIETY AND
WHAT IS DUE FROM EACH TO THE OTHER.

BY REV. J. W. LOVE, D. D.

We all profess to be patriots. We all believe we have the welfare of our country at heart. As professed Christians we go still further and profess to be lovers of mankind. Our holy Christianity requires that we love our neighbors as ourselves, and by our neighbors we usually understand our fellow men of every class and condition in life.

But what, after all, is patriotism? We say it is love of one's country, its institutions, its laws, its government and all that pertains to it. Patriotism is a high sounding word, and we all delight to ring the changes upon it and regard it as a great civic and national virtue, and so it is.

Do we, however, understand the full meaning of patriotism? I fear not. Surely it means more than loving the land on which we live and the kind of government of which we are citizens or subjects. True patriotism means, in its last analysis, loving our neighbor as ourselves. In a republic like ours the condition of the country, its government, whether it be municipal, State or National, its institutions and laws are only the exponents of the condition of the people in their relation to each other. Patriotism must, therefore, find its fullest meaning in the study and treatment of the classes in society towards each other.

That there are classes in society we all know. Ever since the multiplication of the human family there has been division into classes. There will always be the poor and the rich, the ignorant and the intelligent, the humble and the exalted.

There must also of necessity be classification according to occupation, profession and natural capability. All men are not

alike fitted for any one class or position in life. God has ordained that there should be a great variety of talent, and that each one should use his talent for the benefit of himself and of his fellow men. "Like birds of a feather, men and women naturally flock together" in classes, according to taste, culture, occupation, and so on. This we find true in experience and observation.

Now, unfortunately, because of the sin and selfishness in man the classes have come to be antagonistic to each other.

Those who by natural ability or accident acquire wealth are naturally prone to undue exaltation and to use the power that wealth gives to oppress the poor, and to deprive those unable to protect themselves of God-given rights and of proper enjoyment of life.

In our day the classes controlling the larger proportion of the wealth of the country have combined to enrich themselves still more at the expense of the masses. The love of money, or the possession of property, whether for legitimate purposes or for the mere sake of possessing it, is to-day the controlling passion of many in their treatment of each other.

Conscience, in getting money or property, it would seem, in the case of most business men, is asleep, or so blunted and stifled that it scarcely disturbs the comfort at all of a large proportion of those who are daily growing richer from preying upon the necessities of their fellow men. What individuals of some honor and sense of justice would hesitate to do singly they combine to do as corporations and trusts. Take, for example, the Standard Oil Trust as an illustration.

That giant monopoly has the power and uses it to make those who need kerosene oil pay tribute to them as they choose to exact it. We all know how a few wealthy men, by combining, control the trade in meats to enrich themselves at the expense of all who eat meat and even of those who raise the meat consumed, and also how, by combination, they can compel to work, at a low price, those whom they employ to kill, dress and cure the animal food of the country. In fact, about all the necessities of life, and the

labor that produces them are so manipulated by combinations and trusts that the general public is helplessly at their mercy and robbed at will. That this is actually the state of the case can not be successfully denied. As a natural result, it has been truthfully said, the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer year by year. Where this condition of things will end, if there is not a radical reform, God only knows.

Chauncey M. Depew, himself one of the wealthy men of the country, has made the bold statement that there are "fifty men who have it in their power to stop every wheel of trade and commerce within twenty-four hours. They can paralyze the whole country, for they control the circulation of the currency and create a panic whenever they will." That is to say 65,000,000 of people in these United States are absolutely at the mercy, financially, of a coterie of fifty millionaires and multi-millionaires. How were these millions accumulated?

In the main, they are the product of the sweat and toil of the laboring masses. By shrewd manipulation, by buying unjust legislation and by taking advantage of circumstances, or of the necessities of the wage earner, employer combines have withheld from him his just proportion of the wealth he produced, and so increased their profits as to accumulate their vast possessions. We are not inveighing against the accumulation and possession of wealth. It is a natural-born right each one has to obtain, in an honorable and just way, the legitimate product of his skill, enterprise and industry, but we deny the right of any man, or any set of men, to take advantage of the necessities or the ignorance of their fellow men to rob them of honest earnings. It is not brotherly, it is not patriotic, it is not just; and still less is it Christian. Though, as already intimated, we may divide society up into a large number of classes, yet practically we have but two classes, the employer and the employed, including, of course, those dependent upon both these classes, as women, children and the helpless adult sick or infirm. The entire population of any country will be embraced in this classification. We may say there is a necessity for employer and employee. There always

have been and always will be those who serve and those who are served. This has been divinely ordained. The service, however, must not all be on one side. Both classes have their legitimate sphere in serving each other—their natural rights—and when either attempts to take advantage of, or impose upon, the other there is antagonism and hatred engendered.

It is not asserted that all wealthy employers *do* wrong the employed, for there are many noble exceptions—men of honor, and whose desire it is to treat their employees fairly—but, as a rule, such is the selfishness of human nature that corporations, and especially secret combines, study and plan to secure service at the lowest possible remuneration.

They make the price of a day's toil as low as the necessities of the employed will allow; they put them under the surveillance of overseers or foremen, many of whom are harsh in their manner and exacting, to get out of the laborer the most possible for the combine. The cruelties that are thus practiced upon men and women in manufactories, sweat shops, and by corporations employing large numbers of people, are a disgrace to our civilization. Add to this the wrong done by withholding just payment for service rendered, and is it any wonder that the employed cry out against their employers and at times resort to unlawful means of redress?

Patriotism is fostered and developed by laws and institutions that protect *all* classes against wrong and oppression. When government fails to do this there is, to say the least, a cooling of love for country and its institutions on the part of those not so protected.

It is sometimes said that men can refuse to work for employers that wrong and oppress them. That is true, in a sense, and yet it is not true when men and their families are in actual need of the necessities of life. They can starve, of course, or they can beg and steal for a living, as thousands do, but of the evils presented many prefer the lesser, which to their mind is to work for less than comfortable living wages. They are compelled to do this or something worse. This ought not to be, and need not be.

There is enough of provision and of wealth in the country to afford all our people a comfortable living. There is enough of mental ability to plan for human welfare and utilize the country's resources so as to afford all who desire comfort the opportunity to obtain it. There may be and there are large numbers of people who are naturally indolent and vicious, and who do not want honest employment even with fair remuneration. There are those among the poorer classes and the wage earners who are leeches upon the body politic and who would suck the life blood out of their fellow members of society, whether rich or poor. They are no respecters of persons. If they can manage to eke out a mere living by fair means or foul it is all they care for. They would sooner beg than work; and many of them would as soon steal as not, if they can avoid punishment. We should have profound sympathy for even this class of people. We should seek to educate them to a better view of life. We owe it to them to help them, if possible, to a higher ambition in life.

Perhaps it has been bred and born in them to be what they are. Perhaps it is owing to their environment or surroundings that they are what they are. We must not blame them too severely. If we had been born of such parentage or had lived among these unfortunate people from childhood and youth, without opportunity to know or do better, probably we would be no better than they. People born and raised in the slums, or to indolence and theft, can hardly be expected to be industrious and honest. We all show our blood and raising to a greater or less extent. It must also be admitted that among the middle classes and among the wealthy there are many idlers and vicious people. For them there is far far less excuse. They have the opportunity of knowing better. But the wage earners, the producers of wealth, the farmers, the employees in factories and manufactories of all kinds, those who render service of every kind, are often soured in their nature and driven to retaliation upon employers, by unjust treatment.

It is said that "a good employer makes a good employee," and that is generally true. It is also just as true that employers who

have little or no respect for the rights or comfort of the employed are the cause of the discontent that exists and of the bitterness there often is toward capitalists who employ labor.

Men will naturally writhe under what they believe to be injustice and render as little service as they must to those who treat them unfairly. It would be easy to show that there is a great deal of wrong in society, which accounts both for the unrest and the distress there is abroad in the land. It requires no demonstration to prove that we are not loving our neighbor as ourselves; that, as said before, the classes, especially the employer and the employed, are in more or less antagonism. We have neither space nor inclination to inquire who is to blame for this state of things. Indeed, it would hardly be profitable even to know who is at fault, for it would likely lead to crimination and recrimination that would only be hurtful rather than beneficial. It is enough to know that there ought to be, and that there may be, a very much better condition of society than we have now.

The fact that there has been a great deal of wrong and needless antagonism between the classes is no reason why this unfortunate state should continue indefinitely. It would be visionary, however, to expect that as long as human nature is sinful and selfish we can have a perfect state of good will and love between the classes. It would be just as visionary to expect that all people can be put upon an equality as regards intelligence, social standing, possessions and so forth. It is morally certain that there will be these differences, to a greater or less extent, even in heaven. God never made two people exactly alike, and no two ever will be alike in all respects. But there can be no doubt that the condition of society here on earth may be very much improved. We may have a very much better country than we have as to its material prosperity, its social status, its moral improvement, its religious well-being. There are forces available to the masses that may and ought to be utilized for the improvement of the classes.

What are they? We all know that there are a great many theories proposed. There has been a very correct diagnosis of

the disease in the body politic. The doctors are generally agreed as to what is the matter. There has not, however, been such general agreement as to the cure. Some have advocated communism—holding all things in common. That has been tried to a limited extent and found wanting. Others say paternalism—the government owning and directing everything—is the remedy. This seems impractical. Still others tell us socialism would cure all the evils now existing. If socialism, as defined by Dr. J. E. Scott, is meant we give it right of way. He says: "Socialism is essentially coöperation in production, and equitable distribution, or, ethically expressed, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'"

Of course, that is a sovereign remedy, but the trouble is to get all men to take it. The dose is very pleasant to the palate, but unfortunately the stubborn will is in the way of swallowing it. When individual interests seem to be affected by loving our neighbor as ourselves we are still prone to refuse doing so, though we know it is right to do so. *Christian socialism* would correct all wrongs in man's relation to property and to his fellow man. It would be the exercise of justice and love that works no ill to any one of any class or condition in life. It is *applied Christianity* in its purity. Of late years hundreds of able articles have appeared in our leading magazines on this subject of socialism. There is now a respectable library of books treating upon it in all its phases. With much of what has been written, all having a sense of justice and being lovers of the race, whether Christian or not, agree. We are not, however, all agreed as to the State owning all the land, managing railroads, telegraphs and public enterprises in general, and with doing away with all competition. There is undoubtedly much force in the argument made by socialists, but there are many difficulties yet in the way of putting socialistic theories into practice. What proportion of Christian and patriotic people will yet endorse what is commonly understood by socialism it is impossible to predict. But if we confine the definition to that of Dr. Scott just quoted there ought to be no difficulty in accepting it, as both right and practicable.

It is in the nature of things that there should be coöperation in production. Capital and labor both may, and do now combine to produce the necessities and comforts of life, as well as an increase of wealth. There has not been, however, an equitable distribution of the joint products of capital and labor. Of late years especially, the capitalist seems to be getting more than his just share, because he is in a position to demand it and take it, with or without the consent of labor. This is where the wrong comes in. Now *Christian socialism* would give to every man his equitable share of what he or his capital earns, but no more and no less. Is this practicable? Is the force at hand to compel the exercise of this justice and love as over against human selfishness and corporate greed? We believe it is.

1st. *This force is found in Christian Education.* In this the Church must lead. Let it be instilled into the hearts of the young; let it be made to ring in the heads and hearts of the adult population, that there is now great injustice and wrong in the present system of combines and trusts; that is, of oppression and robbery of the wage earner. Education along these lines will crystallize into a consensus of public opinion that will compel a more equitable distribution of the products of labor and capital.

2d. When the public have been brought to see and think right upon this question, *we shall have legislation for the protection of labor and capital* that will be effective in bringing about a better state of things than we have now.

It is not meant, of course, that we can legislate honor, justice or fraternal love into society; but we certainly can protect society by law from the greed of employers as well as protect capital from being wronged by labor.

It is asserted, and probably with truth, that heretofore legislation has been prevailingly in the interest of capital; that our laws, National and State, favor the rich and do not sufficiently protect the poor. It is well known that corporations are able to purchase all the legislation they want, and, as a rule, are not slow to do it. Even city franchises are usually bought without regard

to the public interest, and the money to pay the purchase price afterwards filched from the pockets of the people. Labor is right-fully demanding more protection from the State than has hitherto been given. Perhaps the reason why labor has not received as much consideration as it is entitled to by Congress and State Legislatures is that it has not had a fair representation in the halls of Congress and of State Legislatures. For example, in the present Congress of 536 members in the House of Representatives and 88 in the Senate—624 in all—there are only 33 who represent the labor class, or four-fifths of the population, while there are 345 lawyers—more than one-half—and 246 journalists, merchants, manufacturers, bankers and public officials, all of whom represent capital to a greater or less extent, but only one-fifth of the population. I presume the same disproportion of labor interests is found in our State Legislatures. How can labor expect its claims to be properly cared for with less than one-twentieth of a representation in the law making power?

Now, in view of all this it would seem to be the duty of the wage earners of the country, from patriotic as well as self-protection considerations, to ask for and insist on a much larger representation in the law-making bodies of the country. They have it in their power, by reason of being the larger number, to nominate and elect those in sympathy with them, and they owe it to the country and to themselves to do it. Labor organizations for the purpose of considering and acting in concert upon questions relating to the welfare of society, so largely made up of this class, are a move in the right direction. Of course, there are the dangers to labor as well as capital of being led by demagogues, of making arbitrary demands, and of legislating for selfish, partisan ends; but these dangers may be avoided by proper care, and the general welfare of society be promoted by labor movements wisely directed.

But, again, labor and capital, or the classes generally, may and should unite in harmonious action to secure better legislation on many questions vitally affecting the interests of all. Take for instance the question of competition in any legitimate business.

Socialism would abolish all competition and argues that it would be better for all classes to do so. That *may be* an extreme view. All of us are not prepared to accept the theory that the State could manage well the details of all business. *Christian* socialism, however, would regulate competition, so that no injustice be done to honest business men. Under our present competitive system there is a vast deal of robbery and deception practiced, even by so-called honorable business men. For example: A and B are retail grocers on opposite corners of the street. A is selfish enough to want more than his proportion of the trade of the community and to try to induce as many of B's customers as possible to trade with him. To win them over to his store, he puts down the price of sugar, we will say, to cost. B to protect his trade does likewise. A is determined to beat his competitor and so puts sugar down below cost. But, of course, he cannot do business at a loss very long. He now resorts to short weights, adulteration, inferior quality or making up the loss in some secret tricky way. B is forced to do the same, and so competition becomes not only a means of robbing the public, but also a cut-throat process of the trade. Finally one or the other, or both grocers, are compelled to quit business or go into bankruptcy. Often the wholesaler is cheated out of what is honestly due him. This is frequently the result of competition in most of the retail trade which supplies our homes with the necessities of life. Competition in the wholesale trade has *driven* capital into combines and trusts, enabling the few to control the entire trade in nearly all staple articles of consumption. It is now possible for the combine or trust to put up the price of the necessities of life, and it is usually done. Thus millions are made, as in the case of the sugar trust, oil trust and so on, which go into the pockets of the few who have "a corner" on these articles in common use. Even the retailer, as well as the masses, are now at the mercy of such combinations. Would it then in any way be a curtailment of liberty for State Legislatures to enact more efficient laws protecting the public from this tremendous financial power in the hands of the few? As a matter of

fact, we now have laws in all States fixing the price for the use of capital in money, or the maximum rate of interest it shall bring. In our municipalities we regulate the price of hack hire, street car fare, the price of gas and water by law; in the State we regulate in part the rates of freight and passengers by rail, etc. Would it not be the same in principle to extend such law so as to fix at least a maximum per cent. of profit on all staple articles of food, clothing, fuel, and the investment in tenements for shelter? Might not the same principle be extended still farther to regulate the price of different kinds of labor, and mechanical and professional employments? Of course, there would be a difference of opinion and difficulty in fixing upon prices of staple articles, rates of investments, what should be paid for labor, and so forth, as there is in a schedule of tariff rates fixed by Congress, but there seems to be no reason why we may not approximate more nearly to what is just and right by legal enactment, without abridging personal liberty or jeopardizing the liberty of the whole people.

It would require wise statesmanship to formulate state and interstate laws on this matter of production and cost, but certainly there is enough of talent in this country to meet the demand upon us, if it is admitted that such legislation would not encroach upon liberty or personal rights. It is believed that when the greater good of the whole people is involved there can be no wrong to the few.

Some have held the plausible view that the law of supply and demand will regulate and adjust the prices of all commodities necessary for comfort of life, and the price of labor. The argument is fallacious, as is at once apparent when we remember that a few men have it in their power to control even the supply. Besides, it is not Christian or just even when there is a scarcity of any necessary article of comfort to run the price up beyond the means of the masses to purchase it, or even to compel men to pay an exorbitant price, out of all proportion to cost of its production.

In the matter of the actual necessities of comfortable existence

it is a plain abuse of power for one man or any combination to extort unreasonable prices for what they may be able to hold or control. It should be made a crime to do so, as it was under the Jewish dispensation, and as it really is in the teachings of Christ. It is in plainest conflict with the command to "love thy neighbor as thyself." No Christian can, for a moment, justify taking advantage of the necessity of his neighbor to rob him thus by taking more than any article is really worth or ought bring in all fairness to all concerned.

That this sort of ethics is largely practiced by professing Christians is well known, but we all know also, or ought to know, that it is not the ethics of Old or New Testament Scriptures. It is the ethics of the robber who would come into your house when you are asleep, or overpower you when awake just because he can possess himself of what rightfully belongs to you. Talk as we will about the influence of Christianity or of the Christian religion, the fact stares us in the face that many professed Christians, occupying high and low places in the Church do take shameful advantages of their fellow men in business relations. The world sees this and judges of Christianity by its professed representatives, and then concludes that Christians are as selfish and wicked as those making no profession of religion. As long as there is sin and selfishness in the human heart, we need, in addition to moral or ethical restraints, the restraint of protection of law. We must as far as possible remove the temptation to rob each other by the present competitive system in business practice. As regards the price of labor, our labor unions have tried to take the law into their own hands in regulating it, and the number of hours they should serve for a specific price. They were compelled to do it or submit to ruinous competition among craftsmen of the same class. But they have not been able to compel all labor, even in their own calling to join in with them, and hence non-union men can still underbid them, and this competition among themselves often takes the very bread out of the mouths of many by taking from them the employment necessary to secure it. Employers naturally take advantage of the

situation and give the preference to the cheaper labor. Then as a further protection union men resort to strikes, and an open fight ensues between union and non-union labor. Thus labor is arrayed against labor. Hence, to avoid all such evil and injury to employer and employee, it would seem to be just and right to have laws protecting all from human selfishness and corporate greed by fixing the price of labor and hours of service, as is done in part by United States law. This would remove the temptation also for trade unions to extort from their employers as is sometimes done. Of course, there would still remain the competition as to the quality of the service rendered. But the effect would be that the employer would get better service, and the employed would get the maximum of what the law fixed and would be better satisfied.

Then, too, under this system, it would be possible to establish profit sharing coöperative plants for the carrying on of all kinds of business—as we have now to a limited extent—by which employer and employee would each get a due proportion of the combined product of labor and capital. Thus, if one man, or any number of men desired to establish a manufactory, let there be so much per cent. of earnings allowed on the capital invested; so much for the management; so much for labor of operatives, and then all profit above that, at a specified time, be divided pro rata to proprietors and those producing it according to service rendered. There are not a few—if I mistake not, fully one hundred—of these profit-sharing establishments in the United States. Generally the plan has been found to work well.

Why, it may again be asked, could not such plants be encouraged and protected by law? It is entirely practicable to do so. It would be simple justice and in direct line with the duty of loving our neighbor as ourself to do it.

Another important phase of this general subject is how to provide for the dependent poor and those who, though able-bodied, seem unable and in many cases unwilling to provide for themselves.

It is well known that there is the enormous number of over a

million tramps in this country; statistics, apparently reliable, put the number at 1,500,000. These wandering homeless people tell us they can't get employment. If they could they would probably glut the labor market, as it now is. Besides tramps, there are other millions out of work, and many of them anxious to get work at any price that will keep soul and body together. Are not *all* these our neighbors, and is not the duty of patriotism and the command of Christ to love them as ourselves? What shall we do for them? This ought not be a question difficult to answer.

The county now provides for its indigent and helpless citizens. In connection with many county almshouses there are farms where those able to work are required to earn their living by service on the farm or in the house. Why could not industrial homes be provided by law, as are colleges and other State institutions?

It would not cost as much to do this as it now does to feed the army of idlers that have to be fed anyhow by the public.

In most of our counties, in the West especially, there are large tracts of good land practically not utilized. Suppose each county would buy and set apart, say a section of land for an industrial farm and home, where, as the need would develop, the products of the county could be raised, and where various mechanical employments could be carried on. Suppose, then, that every able-bodied man and woman in the county out of work, and unable to find employment to earn a living, be allowed to go to such industrial home, where they could earn a living, at such work as they could do. Such a home might not only be made self-supporting, but pay the inmates moderate wages for services rendered. That would not only rid us of the tramp nuisance, but it would be of great benefit to those who are now strolling around seeking what they may devour. It would be a great benefit to society in general. Let there be a law also, that if any will not go to such industrial home and work for a living, "neither shall they eat" at public expense. Such (really benevolent) institutions might be established in all the counties of the State and of the United

States. Benevolent hearted people could not put money to better use than voluntarily to give largely to establish and endow such homes.

Once more: What can we do for our neighbors in the filthy slum quarters of our cities? That ought not to be a hard question to answer. It has been answered in part in some of our large eastern cities and in some of the cities of Europe. The plan adopted, and that has worked well, is for men of means to provide clean, comfortable tenements, built in plain style, with all proper sanitary arrangements in the suburbs of cities, to be rented at low rates, sufficient only to pay a reasonable interest on the investment and keep up wear and tear.

This can easily be done everywhere as a business and philanthropic enterprise. It would be done if municipal governments would prohibit landlords or owners of tenements from renting tumble-down shanties, or rookeries where human beings are herded together like cattle, irrespective of sanitary considerations. We all know that the death rate of the slums, where these crowded tenements are found, is from 50 to 100 per cent. larger than in the respectable portions of the city. We all know that these localities are breeding places of pestilence, of degradation and of vice. The city owes it to society, to these poor victims of the slums and to humanity to abolish the slums entirely from all her precincts. There ought not to be, there need not be, any slum quarters. But, you ask, what will you do with people who are already degraded, and who do not want to be helped to better living? The answer is, we can put them in better surroundings in spite of themselves and of their low instincts or desires. Public baths could be provided, and it could be made punishable by law for children or adults to appear in a filthy condition on the street or live in filth at home. Schools could be established for the children of all and attending them be made compulsory, as it is in many places. Public halls and places of proper entertainment could be provided and be made self-supporting.

All this and much more could be done by the Christian, moral and intelligent public for our poorer neighbors, without increasing

our taxes and with great benefit to all. They, the poor and dependent classes, would then be able to serve us in return, as they cannot do now. We and they would be the gainers. Men of wealth, instead of hoarding it in banks, or investing in bonds and stocks, could find much more profitable use for money by investing in philanthropic enterprises in the way suggested.

They would also feel then that they and their money are of some account; that they live to a purpose and are in some measure obeying the divine injunction. Has not the Great Creator of us all ordained that we and our fellow men, our neighbors, should enjoy the good things of life, be happy and comfortable even in our earthly state? Ought not those of us who are the more fortunate in our relations of life be concerned for and try to be helpful to our less fortunate fellow mortals? Surely life is not worth living except as we live for others as well as ourselves. We are not commanded to love our neighbors *more than*, but *as*, ourselves. That means to do unto them as we would have them do unto us, if our circumstances were the same as theirs. It is both reasonable and right that we should all consider each other's welfare and labor for it.

Things have come to that pass in society that something must be done for the betterment of the laboring and dependent classes, or there will be outright rebellion and possible revolution by violence. There is too much unrest and under-the-surface commotion for the indefinite continuance of the strained relations now existing between the classes. The Lord Jesus Christ is the greatest friend the poor or the rich have ever had, and His gospel is the only sovereign remedy for the cure of selfishness and evil in general. But the gospel *needs to be applied*. What has been stated is the gospel of humanity to humanity in a nut-shell. It isn't, by any means, all of the truth, nor even the chief part of the divine message to man, as related to his higher spiritual nature, but, as I have tried to show, it is the *gospel as related to the welfare of each other in our earthly relations*.

Our professedly Christian people must lead in applying this gospel, if it is to bless mankind. The Church has done much,

but scarcely a tithe of what may and must yet be done for the temporal condition of humanity. We need, therefore, to wake up to a sense of duty, or the blood of our brother will cry out against us, and the Divine hand will use the wronged and neglected poor to chastise us as we deserve.

It is frequently charged that the laboring masses are being estranged from the Churches, that they and their families are so made to feel the oppression of capital as to lose faith in the profession of Christian capitalists who occupy prominent places in most of our churches. The wage-earner, therefore, turns away in disgust. There is undoubtedly much truth in the charge. But explain it as we may, the fact remains that in our large cities a large proportion of what are called "tin bucket men" and their families do not attend church services.

While we can't remove prejudice or feeling by argument, nor make people feel at home in uncongenial surroundings, yet prejudice and feeling can be allayed and uncongenial surroundings made congenial to an extent, at least. Capital should be willing to recognize worth where there is worth, and Christians of all classes should certainly cultivate more Christian love for each other than is at present manifest in most quarters. It may be emphasized, therefore, that patriotism demands that we study and plan for the interests of all classes; and Christianity, to be accepted by the masses as the panacea for all wrongs in society, *must be applied* to the every-day affairs of life. It is only thus that people estranged from the Church can be won back and benefited by its teaching. O that our eyes may be opened to see, and that our hearts may be moved to act for the betterment, the comfort and the safety of the whole people—the classes and the masses—in every condition of life.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

VI.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT, FROM THE TIME OF CHRIST UNTIL THE YEAR 730, OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA.

BY REV. CHARLES E. CORWIN.

"Christianity is not only the religion of redemption, inasmuch as it realizes the idea of the divine and the human in the person of the God-man, but also the religion of absolute reconciliation."—*Baur*.

The ideas of redemption and atonement are to be distinguished by referring redemption to the idea of sin and atonement to the ideal of guilt. Redemption is deliverance from the power of sin, while atonement is deliverance from the guilt of sin. In the development of Soteriology the two ideas have been frequently confused, especially in the earlier periods of the history of the Church.

All life is from God. Whatever, therefore, contains a living principle is in some sense at least a revelation from Him. Christianity differs from all other religious systems in that it possesses such a living germ which remains the same in all circumstances, proving its vitality by changing its outward form to correspond to its environment, while the essence of its being remains unchanged. Other systems grow by accretions from without or are painfully and artfully elaborated from the minds of men. Christianity, like the grain of mustard seed, grows by its own energy, intensively outward.

The manifestation of God to man through the person of Jesus Christ is the germ from which all true Christianity is developed. In this revelation, as found in the teachings of Christ himself, and as developed in the apostolic epistles, is the vital principle which fashions every doctrine of a true Christianity. If, therefore, it can be shown that any doctrinal development is a logical

result of the teachings of Christ and His apostles, although it may not be expressed in definite terms in the New Testament, it properly takes its place as the expression of the Kingdom of God advancing among men, even as the branches of the oak, not seen in the acorn, are a proper and logical expression of its hidden life. Whatever, then, is thus developed from Christ is orthodox; whatever is not so developed is heresy.

Among the Jews of Christ's day there were vague ideas of an atonement made for the forgiveness of sin. Philo represents the thought of the Alexandrian school when he teaches that Israel, as the people of God, by their service, perform a sacrifice for the whole world. The High Priest on the day of atonement represents not only Israel, but all other nations before God, and even brings the whole universe into relation with the Infinite.

John the Baptist stands on the border line between the Old Testament and the New. His words, indefinite as they are, contain the first reference to the atonement in the New Testament, an echo of Isaiah's watch cry. "Behold," he says, "the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world." Such expressions, however, are only prophetic of the great doctrine of redemption, peculiar to Christianity, a doctrine which derives its life from the words and work of the Lord Jesus Christ. True it is that he did not in general openly proclaim it, for it could not be properly received until after the crucifixion was made its historical basis. He does distinctly imply it, however, when He teaches that He Himself has come to fulfil the law for men. His work and teaching emphasize two things, the dreadful character of sin and God's hatred of it, and second, God's love and compassion for sinner.

That justice and mercy are to be reconciled is implied, but for the most part unexpressed. To Nicodemus He shows that God expresses His love to the world by the gift of His Son, and this gift is somehow connected with the world's salvation. Later He declares that He, as the Good Shepherd, lays down His life for His sheep and He does this voluntarily. Toward the end of His ministry He begins to teach His personal disciples more plainly concerning the nature of His work, and He even tells them that

the Son of man came to give His life a ransom for many. Christ, however, lays a broad foundation for this doctrine in its practical aspect by the institution of the Lord's Supper. "This is my body broken for you," contains the germ of the whole doctrine. The life of the Son of God is given as a sacrifice in place of sinful men.

Christ's own teachings concerning atonement may be expressed in four propositions:

1. God manifests His love to sinners by the gift of His Son.
2. For the fulfillment of this gift it is in some way necessary that the Son suffer and die. This He does of His own free will.
3. His death is in a mysterious manner a ransom for sinners.
4. Those who are ransomed by Him must become holy.

Enlightened by the Holy Spirit, the apostles saw in the sufferings and death of Christ the ground of forgiveness, and the anti-type of the Old Testament sacrifices, the reconciliation of justice and mercy. "They became not only the organs of Christian consciousness, but channels of authoritative revelation." To teach new truth was not so much their task as to explain to the Church the practical relation of Christ's work and teaching to the individual believer. Of the twelve original apostles only the writings of Peter and John have come down to us, unless indeed the author of the epistle of James be the same as James, the son of Alphaeus. This epistle, however, is of little doctrinal importance, and therefore Peter and John stand as the only representatives of those who heard Christ's teaching. Peter clearly expresses the idea of a ransom paid for the deliverance of men both from the guilt of sin and the love of sin. This ransom is of unspeakable value. We are informed from what the ransom delivers us, but not to whom it is paid (I. Peter 1: 18, 19). Again he teaches that Christ lifted up and carried away our sins in His own person. He endured the punishment for us and the purpose was that the sinners, so freed from the guilt of sin, might become holy (I. Peter 2: 24). In another passage he expresses nearly the same idea. The righteous one bore the sins of the unjust, that the unjust might be brought to God, *i. e.*, that he

might be made like God, made holy (I. Peter 3: 18). His terminology is borrowed from the sacrificial system of the Old Testament, and the idea of vicarious suffering is distinctly taught. Justice is more prominent than love, and the whole subject is treated rather from the practical side.

John, the contemplative disciple, usually takes a subjective view of Christ's work. Deliverance from the love of sin seemed to attract his attention more than deliverance from its penalty. Cleansing rather than pardon is uppermost in his mind (I. John 1: 7). He who most fully teaches the love of God also dwells largely on propitiation, a term which implies pacification of the divine wrath (I. John 2: 1, 2, and 4: 9, 10).

In his Revelation he distinctly teaches that Christ's sufferings and death, represented by the term blood, are the ground of forgiveness and sanctification (Rev. 1: 5 and 5: 9).

Therefore we observe that these two apostles, so different in natural disposition, teach exactly the same thing concerning Christ's work, although the one makes forgiveness uppermost, involving the idea of sanctification, while the other makes the idea of sanctification uppermost, implying previous forgiveness. Both agree in making forgiveness and sanctification to be the result of Christ's voluntary sacrifice in our place. A vicarious, not a moral atonement is set forth, although a moral effect upon the believer is insisted upon as a fruit of forgiveness. The active and passive righteousness of Christ throughout his whole life constitute the ground of redemption, but His sufferings and death are the flower of His atoning work.

It is, however, in the writings of the great apostle to the Gentiles that the doctrine of redemption is most fully set forth. Paul may properly be called the father of soteriology, inasmuch as he is the organ by which the vicarious sacrifice is systematically and scientifically explained. He developed the doctrine of justification by faith, a doctrine which waited until the Reformation for its proper appreciation.

Paul's teaching is founded upon his own personal experience, the great discovery of his life, by which he found that those who

seek righteousness by the works of the law fail, while those who trust in Him who died for sinners are successful, for the just shall live by faith.

The epistle to the Romans is the most systematic theological treatise of the New Testament, and in it, as in no other writing of the apostles, is the idea of vicarious atonement set forth.

All men are proven to be offenders against God's law by nature and by practice. God, however, has provided a way by which He can justly acquit sinners. This is accomplished by the offering of Christ in man's place as a propitiation to divine justice (Romans 3: 24-26). In the development of his argument he specifically states that Christ died for the ungodly, thus giving proof of God's infinite love, and reconciling us to God by the death of a substitute (Romans 5: 6-10). Paul also develops the doctrine in a way not clearly taught by the other apostles. As Adam's sin brought condemnation and death to all men, because he stood as the representative of the race, so Christ, as a second federal head, brings justification and life to as many as obey Him (Romans 5: 18, 19).

While vicarious atonement is expressly taught, the ethical effect is advanced in the same manner as by the other apostles. The love of God, already having justified the sinner, is the ground of his grateful obedience (Romans 12: 1).

In the other epistles of Paul the doctrine is as distinctly, though not so systematically taught. In Galatians Christ appears as the one all-sufficient Saviour, in opposition to Jewish error. In Ephesians and Colossians, in opposition to the beginnings of the Gnostic philosophy, Paul represents Christ as the one perfect medium of divine revelation, Himself divine, and bringing together and to completion all things in Himself. In the other writings of Paul the atonement is treated more from its practical aspect, but with the philosophical basis clearly implied.

The epistle to the Hebrews, probably written by a Pauline disciple and perhaps under the master's personal direction, is inferior to none in its treatment of the doctrine of redemption. Its great advantage consists in its explanation of and its parallelism to the Old Testament types and sacrifices.

Christ is the final and complete revelation of God to man. He, in His threefold office, performs all works necessary for man's redemption. He is the one perfect sacrifice of which all other sacrifices are only shadows. The passages which not only imply, but expressly state vicarious atonement are the following: Heb. 2: 9, 10, 14, 15, 17; 5: 7-9; 7: 26, 27; 9: 26-28; 13: 10-12.

From this brief comparison of the teachings of the apostles, the following propositions may be considered as established beyond rational dispute. One may deny the truth of their statements, but he cannot deny their meaning.

1. God sent His Son into the world to redeem lost men from sin and its punishment, thus manifesting His love.

2. The Son voluntarily took this work upon Himself with all its consequences, thus manifesting His love.

3. God put the sins of the whole world upon the Son so that He bore their sin and punishment, thus satisfying divine justice. This atonement was necessary if sinners are to be saved.

4. This atonement, beside having a positive effect in delivering men from the guilt of sin, also has a moral effect, compelling men from gratitude to put away sin and by the help of the Holy Spirit to live unto righteousness.

Thus we observe that the doctrine of the apostles is identical with the doctrine of Christ Himself, the only difference consisting in the greater development in the epistles than in the gospels. This agreement between the words of Christ and the apostles refutes any theory which claims that Christ had no conception of a vicarious atonement, and that the doctrine was forced upon the Church by the apostle Paul.

As we have now considered briefly the Biblical doctrine of redemption, which is the foundation upon which all legitimate developments rest, we are prepared to begin the study of this idea as it expressed itself in the Christian consciousness of the Church.

The First Period. A. D. 70 to 253.

I. The Apostolic Fathers. 70 to 150.

The age immediately succeeding the generation which had

known the Word made flesh is involved in much obscurity. The young Church, just freed from the control of inspired teachers, knew not how to express itself. It felt the life of the Kingdom of Heaven within its veins, but it could not fully declare that life in words. It could only lisp the language of Canaan. Therefore we must not be surprised to find vague statements of important doctrines, for there were as yet no standard terms. The apostolic Christians saw in the life and death of Jesus a redeeming force, a power which breaks down sin and restores again the image of God and man. Although they seem not to have grasped the idea of satisfaction in its legal sense, yet every Sabbath as they partook of the bread and wine, symbols of Christ's body broken for them and of His blood shed for them, they gave thanks that their sins were forgiven them for Jesus' sake. The tendency of the early Fathers was practical rather than speculative, and therefore they contented themselves with Scripture quotations or, at the most, simple paraphrases.

Ideas have no existence apart from individual men, and therefore if we wish to study the doctrine of redemption in any period we must study it in the writings of men of that period. The oldest reference to the atonement after the writings of the New Testament is that by Clemens Romanus. He says: "Let us look steadfastly at the blood of Christ, and see how valuable it is before God, because, being shed for our salvation, it has brought the grace of repentance to all the world" (Cor. 1. c. 7). Again: "On account of the love which He had for us, Christ our Lord, by the will of God, gave His blood in our behalf, His flesh for our flesh, His soul for our souls" (Cor. c. 49). Three things Clement evidently believed:

1. Christ gave His entire person for our entire person, a sacrifice to divine justice.
2. This sacrifice is of sufficient value to atone for all the world.
3. Christians, by looking steadfastly at Christ, are to be made holy by the moral effects of His work.

Ignatius, a pupil of the apostle John, is not so definite in regard to the atonement as we could wish. He developed rather

the ecclesiastical idea to the exclusion of other subjects. He speaks of peace obtained through the passion and blood of Christ. He uses Christ's sufferings as a motive for personal consecration.

Polycarp was also a disciple of John. His influence throughout Asia Minor was very great, and continued long after he himself had entered the higher service. His interpretation of Scripture was more calm than that of Ignatius, and it was true of him, as Irenæus says, "He ever taught what he had learned from the apostles and what the Church still delivers." Polycarp's views are therefore worthy of the most careful consideration. These three points of Clement's soteriology are found in the following quotation from Polycarp, with several additional ideas: "Christ is our Saviour, for through grace we are righteous, not by works; for our sins He has even taken death upon Himself, has become the servant of us all, and our hope and the pledge of our righteousness through His death for us * * * hold steadfastly to Him who is our hope and earnest of our righteousness, who is Jesus Christ, who bore our sins in His own body on the tree; who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth, but suffered all for us that we might live through Him" (Phil. 1: 8).

The instruction which Polycarp gave his congregation is shown by the following extract from a letter issued by the Church of which he had been bishop. They say that the heathen thought that they wanted the body of Polycarp for purposes of worship, "not considering that neither will it be possible for us ever to forsake Christ, who suffered for the salvation of the saved of the whole world, or to worship any other. For Him indeed as being the Son of God we adore." Letter of Church of Smyrna (c. 17). Barnabas, wrongly thought by some to be the same as the Barnabas mentioned by Paul, thus speaks: "On this account the Lord endured to permit His body to be destroyed, that by the remission of sins we might be sanctified, that is, by the shedding of His blood" (c. 5).

The epistle to Diognetus, written by an author unknown, breathes the spirit of the gospel, and perhaps more than any other writing of the time expresses the soteriology of Paul.

"God Himself gave up His own Son, a ransom for us, the holy for the unholy, the good for the evil, the just for the unjust, the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for the mortal. For what else could cover our sins but His righteousness? In whom was it possible for us, the unholy and the ungodly, to be justified, except the Son of God alone. O sweet exchange! O wonderful work! O unlooked for benefit! That the sinfulness of many should be hidden in one, that the righteousness of one should justify many ungodly" (c. 9).

Paul himself could not have expressed the doctrine of justification by Christ apart from the works of the law in any stronger or more beautiful language.

From these quotations from the leaders of thought in the Apostolic Church it is evident that the Church held vaguely perhaps and more as a matter of Christian consciousness than of doctrinal formula, the following propositions:

1. God's justice must be satisfied.
2. Christ, at God's command, and of His own will, offering Himself as a sacrifice for sinners.
3. Christ's character as divine and as a perfect man are necessary for the vicarious work.
4. The effect of Christ's sacrifice on those redeemed is sanctification.

II. THE HERESIES OF THE PERIOD IN THEIR RELATION TO THE DOCTRINE OF REDEMPTION.

Side by side with the true doctrine grew up the false. Certain heresies began within the lifetime of the apostles and developed along two opposite courses, the one heathen, the other Judaistic. The Judaistic tendency developed into the various forms of Ebionitism, while the heathen tendency ramified into the fantastic Gnostic systems. The Ebionites, with their narrow Jewish view of the Messiah, saw in Jesus only a prophet who had unfolded a stricter interpretation of the law. His death was to them the same as the death of any other martyr, and of course could have no redeeming force. The idea of redemption is there-

fore entirely absent from the Ebionite system. Gnosticism divided itself into two great schools, the Syrian, of which Marcion was head, and the Egyptian, which was controlled by the profounder intellects of Valentinus and Basilides. Marcion could find no agreement between the justice of the Old Testament and the love of the New; hence he rejected the Old, making its author to be an inferior evil deity. There was no real incarnation, for Christ's body was only a phantom; therefore he could not suffer, and there cannot be any such thing as vicarious suffering.

A short statement of the belief of the Ophites, a lesser Syrian Gnostic sect, will explain the position of this class of Gnostics in regard to the doctrine of atonement. According to this system the Aeon, Christ, having descended upon the man, Jesus, enabled him to work miracles and to proclaim the unknown "To ON," who is above the Demiurge of the Old Testament, Jaldabaoth. For this reason Jaldabaoth is angered and causes the man Jesus to suffer, but in these sufferings the Aeon Christ has no share, for he ascends to heaven, leaving Jesus to his fate. As in this and kindred systems there is no real incarnation and no sufferings of a Divine being, the idea of vicarious atonement reaches the vanishing point.

The Egyptian Gnostics were more philosophical in their statements. They held to the inspiration of the Old Testament by an inferior good deity. They taught, however, that suffering is always connected with personal sin. Each sinner must bear his own punishment; hence there cannot be any such thing as vicarious suffering; therefore Christ's atonement is reduced to only a splendid show. Basilides acknowledged the sinlessness of Jesus, but failed to account for this sinless sufferer. Therefore Ebionitism and Gnosticism, although representing the extremes of thought, unite in denying the redemption of Christ, the one by destroying His divinity and the other by destroying His humanity.

III. The Primitive Fathers (150 to 252). As we leave the age of the Apostolic Fathers the stream of doctrinal development widens. The Church, as she is attacked by enemies from without and heretics within, must defend herself. Apologies

and controversial works become numerous. The writers of this century hold firmly to the doctrine of Christ's vicarious suffering, but they allow themselves to be diverted from fundamentals to the consideration of minor points. Besides this, as in the former century, they look at truth from different sides and so express themselves in ways which seem to some critics antagonistic. True unity among those who are led by the Spirit does not consist in uniformity of statement, but in essential spirit. One idea, which has but little ground in Scripture, was developed till it seemed in the writings of certain Fathers to overshadow all else. This idea, founded on such passages as Col. 2: 15 and Heb. 2: 14, etc., was that Christ paid a ransom to Satan for man's deliverance. It probably was the result of the unconscious influence of Gnostic dualism upon the minds of a certain class. Under modified forms this notion maintained itself for centuries, and we shall more fully consider it later.

Justin Martyr, the philosopher Christian, well expresses the orthodox doctrine of his day.

He is explicit as to Christ's nature and as to the effects of Christ's death. His death is an atoning sacrifice for the world. Christ's active obedience was necessary for the perfect offering. By His death He gained a victory over the power of Satan. Good works have no influence upon salvation, but a receptive faith in Christ is required of the individual. The teachings of Jesus have a moral influence for the restoration of the world. Justin combated the docetism of his day with energy, a fact which alone would prove that he held the doctrine of a sacrifice of Christ for sins. The idea that Christ took upon Himself the curse due to men effected him powerfully. Compare, "The Father willed that His Christ should take upon Himself the curse of all for the whole race of man" (*Dia. c. Trypho. c. 95*). Again: "As the blood of the passover saved those who were in Egypt so also the blood of Christ will deliver from death those who believe" (*Dia. c. Trypho, III.*). Tertullian, at a little later day, is the first Christian writer to use the Latin language. His writings are chiefly against docetism, and therefore while not directly

developing the doctrine of atonement he impliedly maintains it, for when he insists upon the reality of Christ's body and of his sufferings and death he really does so because of their relation to the sacrificial offering.

The doctrine of redemption reaches its highest development with Irenæus, and other writers until Anselm only repeat his ideas, or even go backward. Irenæus maintains the doctrine in its broader aspects and positively. He holds firmly to the old idea of a ransom, but he also is the first writer to elaborate the teaching of Paul in regard to Christ's position as the second Adam, the head of a new redeemed race. From this high ground he views the whole field, and shows what we have inherited from the first Adam and what we receive from the second Adam. Christ must be made like unto His brethren in all things that He may redeem all. God must become united to man to conquer evil for man. The whole life of Jesus had a redemptive influence which culminated in His death. The following beautiful passage expresses this thought: "For He went through everything to save all: I say all who believe in Him, who through Him are born to God, infants and little boys, and boys and young men and old men. Therefore he passed through every age, and was made an infant for infants, sanctifying infants; a little boy for little boys, sanctifying those of that age, and at the same time an example to them of piety, of justice and of obedience; a young man for young men, having been made an example for young men, and sanctifying them to the Lord; so also of mature age for the aged, that he might be made a teacher for all * * * at the same time sanctifying the aged, and also becoming an example for them; and so He even passed through death, that He might be the first born from the dead, He Himself holding the first in all, Lord of life, superior to all and before all." The necessity of Christ's incarnation is expressed in the following: "And on this account in the last times the Lord restore us to friendship through His incarnation, being made a Mediator between God and man, pacifying for us the Father against Whom we had sinned."

Irenæus also developed the idea of a ransom paid to Satan, but not in a repulsive form. Perhaps he may have been somewhat influenced by Gnostic dualism when he wrote the following passage: "The Logos, not wanting in essential justice, proceeded in strict justice even against the apostasy or kingdom of evil itself, redeeming from it that which was his own in the first place, not by using violence, but by persuasion, as it became God, so that neither justice should be infringed upon or the original creation of God perish" (Ad. H. 5 : 1).

This passage has been the occasion of much discussion, but the idea seems to be :

1. Man had fallen under the dominion of Satan.
2. Man could not free himself and God would not free him except in absolute rectitude.
3. Christ by persuasion—whatever that may mean—saved man from the kingdom of darkness, thus acting in absolute justice toward all concerned.

Smeaton says of Irenæus: "We call attention to the fact that Irenæus, one of the profoundest minds of all antiquity, in a thoroughly Biblical way took in all previous developments and assimilated them, but made a great advance upon them. He penetrated more fully into the Pauline thought, and it would have been well had no distracting theories subsequently come in to draw the Church aside from the ground he occupied."

We shall now consider the Soteriology of the early Alexandrian school, a school of which Origen is the great exponent. This school was more effected by Gnosticism than any other part of the Church, and therefore the doctrine of redemption is one of the weakest points of its theology. Even the pious Clement combines more philosophy with his religion than is good for the latter. He weakens the one all-sufficient sacrifice by maintaining that the death of martyrs has an atoning efficiency, of the same nature, but of different degree than that of Christ's death. Upon Origen, however, lies the responsibility of dissipating this great doctrine of the Church, thus opening the way for many of the evils which reduced the Christianity of Egypt to the condition in which

it became an easy conquest for the Mohammedan invaders four centuries later. In Origen is observed that struggle between the head and the heart which is often seen in great speculative thinkers. When he spoke according to the dictates of his own experience he was orthodox and Biblical, but when he gave the rein to his imagination he was as much a Gnostic as a Christian. His own religious consciousness gave rise to such expressions as the following: "The entrance of sin into the world made a propitiation necessary, and there can be no propitiation without a sacrificial offering." "Our Lord and Saviour as a lamb was led to the slaughter and, offered in sacrifice for others, He gave remission of sins to the whole world" (Hom. on Numbers 24).

In his character as a speculator, Origen fell into two kinds of error.

1. In regard to the person and work of Christ. The Son or Logos with him is not a necessary being. It is true that he is eternal in a certain sense, for He is begotten from eternity, but only because the Father willed that the Son should eternally proceed from Him. He therefore laid the foundation for the heresy of Arius.

In regard to Christ's redemptive work, Origen held the idea of a price paid to Satan in its most grotesque form. Christ offered himself to Satan as a ransom, concealing His divinity under His spotless humanity. Satan, thus deceived, consented to accept this perfect man as a ransom for sinners, but was unable to keep the holy soul of Jesus on account of His divinity. He therefore lost both Him and his captive, man. He says: "But to whom did He give His soul a ransom for many? Certainly not to God. Was it not then to the evil one? For he himself had power over us until a ransom was given him for us, the soul of Jesus, he (Satan) being deceived, not being able to keep control over it, and not seeing that he could not endure the torture of having it in his possession; therefore when death had gained possession of His glory, not yet did it hold Him when He had come among the dead, free and more powerful than the strength of death itself; so that all of those who have been overcome by death who wish

to follow Him are able to follow, death no more having dominion over them" (Com. on Matt.). How absurd and unscriptural such an opinion is may be readily seen.

2. In regard to the origin and destiny of the universe.

In speculating upon the origin of the universe, the origin of man, the extent of punishment and the effect of good works, Origen allowed his mind to run beyond Scripture or reason. He taught that the amount of matter in the material universe, being less than infinite, was always in a state of evolution through world cycles. Man also passes through periods of transmigration, of which their appearance in this world is but one. They experience a series of falls and restorations throughout an indefinite period. Agreeing with the Egyptian Gnostics, he taught that it was incompatible with infinite goodness to inflict eternal punishment, for according to their theory punishment can be just only when it is corrective. The death of martyrs and the good works of the saints in his system also have power with God. All these speculations of this great thinker are antagonistic to the grand Scriptural doctrine of redemption through a divine-human Saviour. If Christ is less than infinite, as He is, if He is not self-existent and independently eternal, He cannot be an infinite Saviour. If men experience repeated falls and restorations for countless ages in the struggle toward God, the atoning work of Christ is lessened in dignity, for it is a common occurrence in the regular order of evolution. The doctrine of the restoration of all sinners without regard to character is derogatory to the divine justice, and makes the work of Christ an unnecessary display of suffering. Of course the doctrine of the efficiency of good works lowers the value of Christ's sacrifice.

The Second Period. A. D. 252 to 730.

I. General Conditions.

As we begin the study of the doctrine of redemption in the second period of the Church's history, it is well for us to take a brief view of the conditions which influenced its development. Persecution has about ceased at the beginning of the fourth century. Christianity was victorious throughout the whole Empire.

The leaven of the gospel had permeated beyond the bounds of Rome's government and the barbarians of northern Europe were bowing before the cross. The world was in a ferment, politically, religiously and socially.

The Roman Church was growing extensively and intensively. The Greek Church was gradually losing her vitality, and near the end of this period she fell before the rising crescent. Spiritual Christianity was declining and a rigid ecclesiasticism was taking its place. The sense of sin was becoming less throughout the whole period, and therefore the idea of redemption dependent upon it declined also. Apologetics gave way to polemics and doctrine was developed by conflict. Personal opinion was bound by synodical decisions as it had not been in the former period.

II. As in the previous period, we will consider the heresies which influenced the doctrine of redemption, before we proceed to follow the ever deepening stream of orthodoxy. The Ebionitism of the former period, that off-spring of Jewish bigotry, was practically dead. The vagaries of the Gnostics had been driven out of the Church, and had almost become a separate religion under the inspiration of Manes.

The heresies of the period may be classed as Theological, Christological and Anthropological. Under Theological heresies are considered the heresies of Sabellius and Arius. Sabellius by denying any distinction of persons in the Godhead beyond a modal Trinity, brought Christianity into harmony in one essential with the Eastern religion and by so doing destroyed the doctrine of a theanthropic Redeemer, and with this true redemption on the human side. Arius, however, at the opposite extreme, following out the subordination theory of Origen, logically made Christ a creature and so attacked theanthropic redemption on the divine side.

The Christological heresies either confounded the human and divine, or separated them to too great an extent. Under the former head is placed the Eutychian heresy with its branches in Monophysite controversy. The heresies of this class had the same effect on the doctrine of redemption as the Sabellian heresy,

in that they destroyed or rather swallowed up the human in the divine nature of Christ. They left the Church a divine King but not a High Priest touched with the feeling of our infirmities. On the other hand are those heresies which separate the divine and human to too great an extent. The Apollinarian and the Nestorian systems belong to this class. While directly opposing the former systems they really have the same effect upon the doctrine of redemption, for they make Christ a mysterious double being, in no proper sense offering His whole nature as a sacrifice for sins. But if the human nature alone suffers, what is the especial value of the sacrifice? While these controversies engaged the attention of the Eastern Church, Anthropology was developed in the Western Church by the Pelagian controversy. Pelagianism does not bear so directly on our subject. Its influence rather affects the necessity of atonement than the nature of it. However, by making the law as good a means of salvation as the gospel, it makes the atonement of less value, if not altogether unnecessary.

III. Soteriology of the Eastern Fathers. Athanasius first claims our attention. This great thinker gave the strength of his powerful intellect to the support of the doctrine of the true divinity of Christ. To establish this doctrine and to defend it against the attacks of Arius was the work of his life. For this he wrote, preached and suffered persecution. His influence it was which controlled the council of Nicea in 325. Speaking of Christ's work, the creed there framed under the inspiration of Athanasius says: "We believe in one Lord Jesus Christ * * * who for us men and our salvation descended, took upon Him flesh, became a man, suffered and rose the third day and ascended into heaven." Athanasius wrote no treatise on redemption, but his writings are full of allusions to it. His views were strictly Biblical as the quotation from the creed, which undoubtedly expresses his opinion, shows. Perhaps the great Father of Orthodoxy would have done better, however, if he had followed more closely the idea of John, who places salvation from the love of sin among the most important results of redemption. That sal-

vation from sin is as important as salvation from the punishment of sin, Athanasius failed to see, or at least he did not so express himself. He dwells upon the idea that since God had condemned man, his truthfulness required that the sentence be executed, and he seeks to show how that the divine truthfulness is maintained and goodness shown by the substitution of Christ as a victim. In order to make this substitution of sufficient value he strongly insists upon the real incarnation of the Logos, and he shows how Christ's taking upon Himself human nature sanctifies humanity. The following passage well expresses his opinion concerning the necessity of the incarnation for the atonement:

"For the Logos knew that not otherwise could the corruption of man be cleansed except through the death of all. As it was not possible for the Logos, being incorruptible and the Son of the Father, to die, on this account He took upon Himself a mortal body, that this, being assumed by the Logos for all, might become liable to death in behalf of all. And, because the incorruptible Logos dwelt in it, it remained, and for the rest the corruption of all ceased by the grace of the resurrection. For this reason, as a victim and a sacrifice, free from all spot, He took upon Himself a body, undergoing death, and straightway freed all His fellows from death by the offering of a substitute" (*De Incarnatione Verbi*, c. 9).

The views of Athanasius exerted a strong influence throughout the Eastern Church, and his idea that Christ's divinity was necessary to render his sufferings of sufficient value to atone for infinite guilt prevailed in the orthodox theology. Eusebius of Cæsarea shows the effects of this idea when he teaches that Christ is the divine Head of a human body, the Church. Hence any evil which befalls the members is felt by the Head. Hence the prophets represent the ideal man, *i. e.*, Christ, as confessing sin and undergoing punishment. In accord with Athanasius, the sufferings of the Head, because divine, are of sufficient value to atone for the sins of the members. Cyril of Jerusalem also shows the same influence. God maintains His truthfulness and yet finds a way to pardon sinners. Therefore goodness and

mercy are united and the divine veracity is maintained. Compare the following:

"For we were enemies to God on account of sin, and God swore that the sinner should die. Therefore one of two things must take place: either God, being true, must destroy all, or, loving man, must pass by the execution of the sentence. But behold the wisdom of God: he preserves His truth by the execution of the sentence and the operation of his love toward man" (Cat. 13: 33).

The three great Cappadocians, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory Nazianzen, now claim our attention. They follow closely in the footsteps of Origen. Satan plays an important part in the scheme of redemption of the two first. According to Gregory of Nyssa, Christ offered Himself as a ransom to Satan for sinners. The devil accepted the offer, because he saw Christ's sinless character, but failed to recognize His divinity. But Christ, because He was divine, could not be held by Satan, and escaped Himself and took man with Him. God could have saved man simply by using force, but He chose this way, and therefore the atonement is only a relative necessity. In these ideas he agrees almost entirely with Origen. Basil follows in about the same path, but claimed that there was no other method possible, and he therefore made atonement an absolute necessity.

He held that it was useful for one to have right conceptions of the method of atonement, but that a mistake was not serious so long as the essential personal truth was held. He denies that the price was paid to Satan, considering such a thought shameful. Neither was the ransom paid to the Father because His wrath must be appeased, but because the divine economy demanded that a ransom be paid. His idea of Christ's work is well summed up in a few words: "He has ascended the cross, and taken me with Him, to nail my sins on it, to triumph over the serpent, to sanctify the tree, to overcome lust, to lead Adam to salvation, and to restore the fallen image of God" (Orat. 24: 4). John Chrysostom, the pious and eloquent preacher of Constantinople, made no advance in the doctrine. His mind was not given to speculation. Practical piety of heart expressing itself in a Chris-

tian life was the purpose for which his energy was exerted. That he held to the Scriptural doctrine of the atonement in its entirety, the following quotation from his commentary on (Romans 5: 17) shows: "For Christ has paid far more than we owed, as much more as a boundless ocean compared with a drop of water. Doubt not then, O man, when you see such a wealth of benefits; nor inquire how that spark of death and sin can be extinguished when such a sea of blessings is let in upon it." As the allegorical method of interpretation waned with the decline of the Alexandrian theology, a more rational method was employed in the school of Antioch. Of the soteriology of this school Theodoret is a good exponent. His interpretations are for the most part strictly Biblical and in treating of atonement he often confines himself to paraphrases of Scripture. In regard to the relation to Christ to the kingdom of Satan, he taught that Christ conquered Satan in so far that he resisted the severest temptations and stood where Adam had fallen. As the new Head of the race, He therefore took by right Satan's captive from him. The next three hundred years add little to the history of doctrine in the Greek Church. The views of the former writers were held, but not arranged. Athanasius held the first place in authority and his statements become more and more the standard of orthodoxy. The chill of spiritual and intellectual death was creeping over the Greek Church. Just before the beginning of the Scholastic era, a last expiring flame of the old fire flashed forth from the stagnation of the Greek Church. John of Damascus was not original, for the age of originality long before had passed. His task was to systematize the labors of the giants of a former time and to present the results of their intellectual efforts to the pygmies of his own time. He held to the vicarious death of Christ and denies that the ransom was paid to Satan. Thus He distinctly says: "He who assumed death for us died and offered Himself a sacrifice to the Father, for we had committed wrongs toward Him, and it was necessary for Him to receive a ransom, and we thus be delivered from condemnation. For God forbid that the blood of the Lord should be offered to

a tyrant (*Ex. Fidei*, III. 27). The great fault of the Greek Church was that she spent too much time in the elaboration and discussion of minor points, while she neglected the fundamental and practical aspects of redemption. The gospel furnishes poor material for the intellectual gymnastics of the mere sophist. The Greek Church failed to grasp the idea of the absolute necessity of atonement in the justice of God. Relative necessity seemed a sufficient reason to her for the great mystery of the incarnation, and so by losing sight of the greatness of redemption she was led into all manner of unprofitable speculation. The Greek Church, as a whole, however made the extent of the atonement unlimited, nay, even in the school of Alexandria the influence of the atonement was made to extend beyond this world and to take in the whole universe.

Having glanced briefly at the views of a few of the more prominent exponents of Greek theology, we will now turn our attention to the expression of the doctrine of atonement in the Latin Church.

IV. The Soteriology of the Latin Fathers.

The Roman mind was more practical and not so subtle as that of the Greek. Rome could conquer Greece by force of arms, but Greece in turn could make Rome become a pensioner to her intellect. Consequently it is not surprising that doctrinal subjects received less attention in the Roman Church than in the Greek. While the Greek Fathers were speculating on the relation of the persons in the Trinity, and the mysteries of the incarnation, Rome was engaged in perfecting that ecclesiastical organization which has become the example of a perfect organism for the whole world, and in vast missionary operations. Therefore we find in the Latin Fathers ideas concerning the atonement borrowed directly from the keener schools of Alexandria and Antioch. All the Fathers of this period held, however, to the doctrine of a vicarious and expiatory sacrifice. Moral atonement, as such alone, was unknown to them. After Tertullian, who belongs to the former period, the first great name is that of Cyprian. Cyprian was a strong Churchman. He was the first to lay stress on the

doctrine of apostolic succession. To him the Church organization and the Kingdom of God are one. His whole power was devoted to increasing the strength of the Church as an organization. Hence he says little upon soteriology. That he held however to Christ's vicarious sacrifice is proven by numerous incidental statements. The following quotation is an example: "Christ bore us all who also bore our sins" (Epistle 63).

Ambrose, although belonging to the Latin Church, was essentially Greek in spirit. Christ's divinity was one of the chief thoughts in his mind. God became incarnate for the sake of saving men by the substitution of an infinitely valuable sacrifice. Contrary to the opinion of most of the Greek Fathers, this sacrifice is limited in extent, being made only for the sake of the elect. He says: "God therefore took flesh, that he might abolish the curse of sinful flesh, and was made a curse for us, that the blessing might swallow up the curse, sinlessness sin, benevolence condemnation and life death, that the sentence might be fulfilled, that satisfaction might be made" (Lib. de Tob. 10 c: 7).

Ambrose, while not holding the extreme view of a fraud practiced on Satan, nevertheless thought that Satan was deceived when he tempted Jesus by the appearance of his humanity.

We would suppose that Augustine, the greatest thinker of the Western Church, would express himself clearly on so important a doctrine as the doctrine of the atonement. But such is not the case. Anthropology was the department upon which his intellect expended its strength, and while much of soteriology is implied in a proper anthropology, it is only implied, and not definitely stated. In soteriology Augustine shares the faults of his time. He never distinguished clearly between justification and sanctification as the following passage proves: "God justifies the ungodly not only by remitting the sins he commits, but also by giving him inward love, which causes him to depart from evil and makes him holy through the Spirit" (C. Julianum II. 165). Augustine was somewhat affected by the idea of a price paid to Satan, thus: "God the Son being clothed with humanity subjugated even the devil to man, taking nothing from him by vio-

lence, but overcoming him by the law of justice; for it would have been injustice if the devil had not had the right to rule over the being he had taken (*De Libero arbitrio* III. 10). How foolish this view is according to modern ideas. Yet the fact that it was so strongly expressed by the greatest religious thinker of the 5th century shows how great an advance the Church has made in her ideas of the plan of salvation. Augustine, however, develops quite fully the priestly kingship of Christ. "He indeed was anointed both King and Priest. As King He fought for us, as Priest He offered Himself for us. He fought for us after the manner of one conquered, but yet He was victorious. For He was crucified, and from that cross of His on which He was fixed, He slew the devil, and for this reason He is our King. Moreover, why is He Priest? Because He offered Himself for us * * * and what gift, what victim could a man find to give? What gift could a sinner offer? O wicked one, O guilty one, whatever you could offer is unclean, and yet an offering must be made for thee. Therefore the holy Priest offered Himself and made purification. That is what Christ did. No gift did He find in man which He could offer; therefore He gave Himself, an holy victim. O happy victim; O true victim; O sacrifice immaculate" (*Com. on Psalm 143*).

Augustine strongly expressed the necessity of a true divinity in Christ, in order to make the sacrifice of infinite value, and at the same time a true humanity, in order to make the offering that of mankind, was "seen by Him to be equally important. "Our priest received from us what He might offer for us, for He took flesh upon Himself and in that very flesh He was made a victim, a burnt offering, a sacrifice" (*Com. on Psalm 149*).

Augustine elaborated the idea of a definite atonement in opposition to the almost unanimous opinion of the Greek Church. In this respect, however, he was in substantial agreement with Cyprian and Ambrose. Sometimes he speaks as if the atonement was only a relative necessity, but he also expressly declares that he considers debates concerning the possibilities of divine method to be unprofitable and foolish.

After the time of Augustine the Latin Church began to lose her intellectual power. Men no longer thought for themselves, but depended upon the thought of former generations. As in the Greek Church, with the ending of the fifth century the age of great men passed away, to be succeeded by the age of little men. Unlike her Eastern sister, however, the Latin Church did not lose her vitality altogether. She abandoned intellectual activity for the sake of consecrating all her vast energies to the extension and unification of her ecclesiastical power. Orthodoxy still repeated the statements which had been elaborated by the early Fathers, and no doubt in the midst of a growing legalism many a member of the external Church felt their inward spiritual force and became not only a member of the external kingdom of God, of which so much was made, but also a true member of that spiritual kingdom which cometh not with observation. Even Gregory the Great, who has often been called the first Pope, and who would not be expected to be very spiritual in his views, clearly expresses the idea of vicarious atonement, when he says, "Our Lord endureth for us a death not due, that the death due to us might not harm us" (*Moralia in Jobum* 17: 46).

In the early centuries the doctrines of the atonement was evidently considered one of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. It was the unique feature of the Christian system. Schools might disagree with each other; Church Councils might engage in unseemly strife over unintelligible statements concerning the person of Christ; the bishop of one Church might anathematize his neighbor in the episcopal office, but all agreed in acknowledging the atonement as the one necessary truth of Christianity.

Tenaciously was the doctrine held throughout the early centuries of the Church's life, often more as a matter of religious experience and Christian consciousness than as a formulated dogma. No great controversies were waged concerning it, and yet, perhaps, the indignation with which certain theories respecting Christ's person were received arose from the feeling that such theories were derogatory to the great sacrifice of the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world.

There were two evil tendencies in regard to this doctrine in the early Church. The first was a tendency to develop minor details, to the exclusion of the more important. This was an error of judgment rather than of the heart. One of the chief ways in which this tendency showed itself was the inclination to magnify Satan's relation to the offering of Christ. As we have seen, these views regarded Christ's death either as a ransom paid to Satan, as a conquest over him, or as the result of the devil's cruelty by which he overstepped his right and so lost his right in the human race. The Fathers who held such views were unable to grasp the higher ideas of the doctrine, and so made the great offering merely a relative thing, for which God could have substituted something else if he had wished. They failed to see that it is no denial of omnipotence to say that God always acts in character. More dangerous was the tendency which made other things besides the sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus to have a power in redemption. This evil tendency arose very early, for even Polycarp speaks of works which save from death. In the Western Church, Tertullian, and at a later day Augustine, were arch-offenders. In the East the school of Alexandria, of which Clement and Origen are chief exponents, exerted a baleful influence in this direction. With the declining sense of sin and the increasing ecclesiasticism of an ambitious and worldly clergy, the tendency developed rapidly and finally bore the bitter fruit of the doctrine of salvation by works. This doctrine brought the Church of Christ into bondage to the law for nearly a thousand years. Ascetic practices, prayer to saints, elaborate systems of penance, are all the legitimate results of this tendency which is diametrically opposed to the gospel, in accord with which Christ is made to us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

HEREDITY AND CHRISTIAN PROBLEMS. By Amory H. Bradford. New York, Macmillan & Co. 1895. Pages, 293.

Some idea of the range of thought embraced in this volume may be obtained from the table of contents, which is as follows, each subject forming the title of a separate chapter: "The Law of Heredity," "Theories of Heredity," "Physical Heredity," "Intellectual and Moral Heredity," "Environment," "The Problem of the Will," "The Problem of the Home," "The Problem of Education," "The Problem of Pauperism," "The Problem of Vice and Crime," "The Problem of Sin and the Race," "The Problem of Faith," "The Problem of the Person of Christ," "Conclusion."

The author, of course, accepts the theory of evolution, and applies it to the solution of some of the hard questions in theology and ethics. There is no doubt that the answers which some of these questions have received in the past are no longer satisfactory. We agree with the author in the following propositions, contained in the preface of the book before us: "More than most persons dream, the old ways of presenting such truths (as those discussed in this volume) have disappeared, and would no longer be tolerated by those that call themselves conservatives. There is no philosophical basis for the ideas of reprobation and condemnation of sins never committed. There is no longer need of arguing against such teaching; it has gone, and would never more be heard if it were not raised from its grave every now and then by over-zealous opponents, who ignorantly imagine that they are fighting against living antagonists." This is true, doubtless, of some of the older forms of the doctrine of "original sin," and of kindred doctrines. On these subjects the doctrine of evolution has thrown much light, although it has not yet solved every question that may be connected with them:

Many have been afraid of the theory of evolution because of its supposed subversion of the foundations of morality and religion. How groundless this fear is may be learned from a careful perusal of the book here under notice. Take, for instance, the chapter on "The Problem of the Will." That the will is undoubtedly influenced largely by heredity and environment, must be admitted by all intelligent persons, and this fact should be taken into account in all efforts of reform whether social or individual. But is the will still free, or is it merely the slave of heredity and environment? If the latter, then the

individual is without responsibility for its acts, and no sin can be properly imputed to the person who commits it. Some have taken the position that evolutionists are bound to take this view of the case. Some evolutionists have taken this view; but the majority refuse to do this, and yet claim to be consistent evolutionists. To this class belongs Dr. Bradford. While fully admitting the influence exerted upon the will by heredity and environment, he says, page 90: "In every man there is an untainted power, something which passes from generation to generation untouched by change, and in this ultimate essence of personality rests the power of choice, which may be shut in by evil conditions and tied to a thousand evil tendencies, but which is in its nature free, and is rarely, if ever, entirely denied expression."

According to Dr. Bradford man is the product of three factors, namely, heredity, environment and personality. Neither of these acts independently of the other two, and no one of them is omnipotent. The force or tendency of heredity may be overcome, or at least modified, by environment; and both heredity and environment may be controlled by personality, or the power of will. The will exists as an original, self-determining force in every man. It may surrender its power, and the man may float passively on the stream of circumstances; but it may also assert its power, and the man may become something different from what the law of heredity and the influence of environment, if they had acted alone, would have made him.

This truth is especially apparent in the case of Christ. In the chapter on the problem of Christ the author of the book before us confines himself simply to the negative task of showing that Christ could not be explained by the operation of the laws of heredity and environment. Christ is something more than the life and nature of the Jewish race, and the enviring circumstances under which He lived would have made Him to be. Those who have looked with suspicion upon all evolutionary science, because of its supposed unfavorable bearing upon the doctrine of the incarnation, may here find assurance that their suspicion has been groundless. Christ is not an impossibility in a world produced or developed according to fixed laws. But Christ is no accident either, having come into the world independently of the continuity and harmony of its own life. That is a truth which the doctrine of evolution has clearly taught.

In conclusion we would say that we have read this book through, and do not hesitate to recommend it to thoughtful persons as a work of interest and profit. To ministers of the gospel, to teachers, reformers and philanthropists, to students of sociology, and to fathers and mothers rearing up families, it will afford valuable aid. They will not find in these pages a

solution of all their doubts and difficulties, perhaps, but they will find much that will be stimulating to thought and helpful in arriving at proper conclusions. W. R.

DOCTRINE AND LIFE: A Study of Some of the Principal Truths of the Christian Religion in their Relation to Christian Experience. By George B. Stevens, Ph. D., DD., Professor in Yale University. Silver, Burdett & Co., New York, Boston, Chicago. 1895. Pages, 251.

The design of this volume is fully expressed in the title page. In the preface the author tells us that its "aim is to present the principal doctrines of Christianity in their correlation with the Christian life." "These doctrines," he continues, "have therefore been approached from the point of view of the Christian consciousness rather than from that of philosophy or criticism. Our main question in this study is not, How might the Christian philosopher justify the belief under review? nor, How might the Biblical scholar elaborate and defend it? but, What is the adaptation of the given doctrine to the needs of the soul, and its use in the Christian life? How is its truth attested in experience?"

In the light of the principle here set forth the following subjects are treated in as many separate chapters: "The Relation of Doctrine to Life," "The Soul Naturally Christian," "The Belief in God," "Revelation and the Bible," "The Character of God," "The Trinity," "The Person of Christ," "The Work of the Spirit," "The Fact of Sin," "The Intercession of Christ," "The Doctrine of Faith," "The Doctrine of Love," "The Doctrine of Prayer," "The Future Life." The treatment of these subjects is able and thorough, and the volume contains a great amount of material that can be made fruitful for homiletic purposes. The preacher, accordingly, will be especially interested in the treatise, although it is free from technicalities and written in a style that makes it intelligible to thoughtful persons generally.

There is a tendency in our day to depreciate doctrine in favor of practice. It is often said that doctrine is of little account; practice is the important thing; and there are ministers who studiously avoid the discussion and even the study of doctrine, and devote their time and attention entirely to what are supposed to be practical themes. It is not what people believe, but what they do, that makes them Christians. Now there is a truth as well as an error in this view. The truth is that doctrine, merely as an intellectual interest, regarded as something separate and apart from life, can have no religious value. It is possible to present doctrines in such way as to make them useless for religious and moral purposes. For instance, the doctrine of the Trinity might be preached in such a manner as to make it in-

different to the hearer how many persons there might be in the Godhead, whether three or three hundred.

It is, however, an error, on the other hand, to suppose that Christian practice can long be divorced from Christian doctrine. This proposition is clearly demonstrated in the book under notice. Even the doctrine of the Trinity, which in itself is so profoundly mysterious and abstruse, is yet full of practical interest for the Christian believer; and it is the business of the Christian preacher always to present it in its relation to Christian faith and life. The difficulty which such doctrines as that of the Trinity usually occasion in homiletic practice generally arises from the fact that, instead of being presented as concrete realities in relation to life, they are presented as intellectual problems whose truth is to be demonstrated as propositions in mathematics are demonstrated. How many arguments have been wasted upon the vain effort to demonstrate the proposition that three may be one and one three?

Another circumstance which has tended to make doctrine unpopular has doubtless been the fact that the doctrines presented in many Christian pulpits have been adjusted to philosophical and critical schemes, rather than to the Christian consciousness and life. For instance, the doctrine of original sin has been so preached as to make it to mean the idea of the imputation of the guilt of another's transgression, and the doctrine of atonement as the idea of the vicarious punishment of sin. But these ideas now do not commend themselves to the Christian consciousness. When plainly presented to the minds of common Christian men they shock the finer sensibilities and the conscience. Nevertheless the preacher says that he gets them out of the Bible by the application of his exegetical methods, and that they must therefore be true. What, then, is the result? The result is a sort of half-conscious conclusion that Christian or Biblical doctrines, while true in themselves, are not *practical*; they have no immediate relation to Christian life and conscience, and may be remitted to the limbo of abstract theology whose contents are wholly unfit for practice.

Doctrines, in order to be preached with effect, must be true as tested by the touchstone of Christian consciousness and experience. It is to this test that Professor Stevens brings the doctrines which he reviews in this volume. Not that he is, therefore, unscriptural; for the Scriptures, *rightly* interpreted, cannot be in opposition to the teaching of the Holy Spirit in the Christian heart and conscience. His views of such doctrines as those relating to revelation, to inspiration, to the character of God, to sin, to the atonement, to the work of the Spirit, and so forth, we believe to be Scriptural and true; and we, therefore, commend this volume to our readers as one that will prove

itself to be inspiring and helpful to them in the formulation of Christian truth. W. R.

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY. By Alexander Balmain Bruce, D. D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Free Church College, Glasgow; Author of "The Kingdom of God," "The Training of the Twelve," etc. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1894. Pages xiii. and 404.

Professor Bruce is well known both in England and in this country as an able, vigorous, liberal and progressive theologian. His previous publications, although at one time they excited a suspicion of heresy in the minds of some of the brethren of his Church, have generally been well received by thoughtful men in the ministry and have helped many to higher and clearer views of Christian truth. We have no doubt that the present work, which is published as a companion volume to the author's previous work on "The Kingdom of God," will be equally well received and found to be equally valuable.

Works of this kind belong to the comparatively new science of Biblical Theology. Biblical Theology is the theology of the writers of the Bible, who were not one, but many. Consequently there must be more than one phase or form of Biblical Theology. We speak accordingly of a Pauline, a Petrine, a Jacobine and a Johannine theology in the New Testament. These, of course, must be reducible to a common organic system of truth; but among themselves they differ, and each must be studied by itself before they can be compared and treated as parts of a common whole.

St. Paul is the special apostle of Protestantism. The Reformers went back, or believed that they went back, to the teaching of St. Paul in regard to the doctrines on which they differed with the authorities of the Catholic Church. But the Reformers themselves were not free from the influence of Catholic tradition in the study of St. Paul. They read Paul in the light of St. Augustine. They accepted Augustine's doctrines of sin and grace and read them into St. Paul, but then refused to draw the conclusions which the Catholic Church had drawn practically in its ecclesiastical system. It is only in more recent times that the influence of Augustine in the study of St. Paul has been broken. Such writers as F. W. Farrar, A. Sabatier, George B. Stevens, Professor Beyschlag, and a host of German theologians, have studied Paul independently of past traditions, and no longer find in Paul the "hard doctrines" which the older Protestantism had inherited from Augustine.

It is to this class of theologians that Professor Bruce belongs. While more conservative than some of the writers whom we have mentioned, Professor Bruce belongs to the modern school

of Christological and historical theology; and his interpretation of St. Paul is determined, not by the idea of divine sovereignty or election, but by the idea of Christ as the revelation of the divine love and grace looking to the salvation of all men. The hard system of absolute predestination, involving a double decree of election and reprobation, which Calvin declared to be a *decretum horrendum*, used to be supposed to have an impregnable foundation in the writings of St. Paul, and to be opposed to this system was believed to be equivalent to opposition to the very Spirit of God. But now, thank God, that spell is broken, and the number of theologians who still find in St. Paul a doctrine so dishonoring to God and so horrible to man is getting continually smaller. Professor Bruce writes on page 321 of the volume before us: "These chapters of the Epistle to the Romans (IX.-XI.) have been, by Scholastic theology, put to uses for which they were never intended. They are not a contribution to the doctrine of the eternal predestination of individuals to everlasting life or death. Their theme is not the election of individuals, but of a people. And the point of view from which the principle of election is contemplated is historical. * * * But still more important is it to note that in these chapters election is not conceived of as an arbitrary choice to the enjoyment of benefits from which all others are excluded. Election is to *function* as well as to *favor*, and the function has the good of others besides the elect in view. * * * It is unnecessary to point out that this view is in accordance with the uniform teaching of Scripture, and very especially with the teaching of Christ, in which the elect appear as the light, the salt and the leaven of the world. It is a vital truth strangely overlooked in elaborate creeds large enough to have room for many doctrines much less important, and far from sufficiently recognized, as yet, even in the living faith of the Church, though the missionary spirit of modern Christianity may be regarded as an unconscious homage to its importance."

This quotation may serve to give the reader an idea of the manner and style of Professor Bruce's work. It indicates his standpoint in relation to one of the crucial questions concerning St. Paul's thinking. The book before us is in general harmony with this standpoint. And in our opinion this is a far juster interpretation of St. Paul than is the Augustinian and Calvinistic view, which has been in the habit of parading itself as the only orthodox doctrine of Christianity.

It only remains to add that the volume under notice is not in the proper sense a commentary; it is not exegesis, but the result of exegesis, that we have in this work. It is a systematic representation of the mind of St. Paul based upon a careful exegetical study of his writings. The book, accordingly,

is comparatively easy reading; and we recommend it to those who are interested in the progress of theological thought.

W. R.

THE BOOK OF TWELVE PROPHETS : Commonly called the Minor. By George Adam Smith, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. In two Volumes. Vol. I.—Amos, Hosea and Micah. With an Introduction and a Sketch of Prophecy in Early Israel. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1896. Price, \$1.50.

This is a highly interesting volume. Its author, Dr. George Adam Smith, in his Exposition of Isaiah, which appeared among the earlier volumes of the "Expositor's Bible," showed himself to be possessed of such qualities of scholarship, fairness, historical imagination and enthusiasm for his subject, that his exposition has been generally acknowledged as most instructive and valuable. The same qualities characterize the present volume, which forms part of the same series. The work is the result of exact critical study and is based on thorough examination of the entire text in the light of the ancient versions and of the best modern criticism. It consists of a general introduction to the Book of the Twelve Prophets and of expositions of the prophecies of Amos, of Hosea and of Micah. In the introductory chapters, the Book of the Twelve, the Prophet in early Israel, the Eighth Century in Israel, and the Influence of Assyria upon Prophecy, are considered. The treatment of all these subjects is very brilliant and scholarly. The same may be said of the expositions which follow and make up the body of the volume. They are all exceedingly lucid and satisfactory. They bring vividly before the mind of the reader the prophets of whose utterances they treat, and throw much desirable light upon their prophecies. No one, we think, can read the volume without delight and profit. It will undoubtedly add to the author's reputation as an expositor and to the value of the series of which it forms a part. We heartily commend it to all our readers as a book worthy a place in every Bible student's library.

MORAL LAW AND CIVIL LAW : Parts of the Same Thing. By Eli F. Ritter. New York, Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati, Cranston & Curtis. 1896. Price, 90 cents.

The author of this small volume, we infer from what he says in the preface to it, is a member of the legal profession. His purpose in writing it has been to aid in determining definitely the meaning of morality and moral character, concerning which he claims many persons seem to have very indefinite ideas. Among the subjects especially discussed in the book are the law of public necessity, the nature of morality and of immorality,

the relation of morality to legislation and to common law, the growth of law, and the necessity there is for suppressing that which is evil and promoting that which is good. The conclusion at which he finally arrives is: "There can be no safety for any people or government outside of sound legal principles. There can be no sound legal principles unless founded upon morality." Because of the truth set forth in the latter of these statements, he holds that moral law and civil law are parts of the same thing. The book is well written and will repay study.

BAPTISM AND FEET-WASHING. By Rev. P. Bergstresser, D. D., Author of "Vain Excuses Answered," "Waynesboro' Discussion," etc. Philadelphia, Pa., Lutheran Publishing Society. 1896. Price, \$1.00.

In 1879 Dr. Bergstresser engaged at Waynesboro', Pa., in a discussion concerning the Mode of Baptism, the Subjects of Baptism and Feet-washing. Two thousand copies of this discussion were published, but the edition was soon exhausted. The present volume is an outgrowth of this discussion. In it, however, the propositions discussed are more fully treated than they were in the debate referred to. The book is written in a clear and forcible style, and its arguments are generally strong and convincing. Its author on every page shows himself to be thoroughly acquainted with the subjects he discusses. Those who are interested in knowing what the Scriptures really teach concerning the mode and subjects of baptism and the meaning of feet-washing will find this a really helpful volume. It is a work which deserves to be widely circulated and read, and the careful study of which cannot fail to result in good.

GERHARD'S SACRED MEDITATIONS. Translated from the Latin. By Rev. C. W. Heisler, A. M. Philadelphia, Pa., Lutheran Publication Society. 1896. Price, \$1.00.

This is a new translation of the *Meditationes Sacre* of Johann Gerhard, the eminent Lutheran theologian. The work was first published in Latin in 1606. On account of its superior merit it was speedily translated into German, and later into most of the languages of Europe. An English translation by R. Winterton appeared in 1631 and passed through many editions. This new translation runs very smoothly and will no doubt make the work more acceptable to English readers of our own time. As a devotional manual it properly ranks with the well known "Holy Living and Dying" of Jeremy Taylor. It is made up of fifty-one meditations on as many different subjects. All of these meditations are full of religious fervor and spiritual insight. They are admirably designed to beget a devotional state of mind and to promote a truly spiritual life. The book is one that should find a place in every Christian family.

THROUGH THE ETERNAL SPIRIT: A Biblical Study on the Holy Ghost.
By James Elder Cumming, D. D. Fleming H. Revell Company, Chicago,
New York and Toronto. 1896. Price \$1.50.

Among works treating of the person and work of the Holy Ghost this occupies a place in the foremost rank. It is the production of a scholarly minister of the established Church of Scotland, who is distinguished because of his ability and spiritual-mindedness. In preparing this treatise he says in his introductory pages: "My object has been to present the whole teaching of Scripture in a short compass, and in a clear and methodical order, so that all may find here not only the conclusions come to by the author, but materials gathered by means of which every reader may test the accuracy of these and form his own judgment." It is, accordingly, a clear, able and complete presentation of the Scripture teaching concerning the Holy Ghost, and not a subtle metaphysical effort to explain the inexplicable. No one, therefore, can read it without profit. It has well been said of it: "It is profound enough for the most thoughtful, yet it is so lucid and interesting as to be understood and enjoyed by the youngest disciple." It ought to have a place in ever minister's library, and deserves to be carefully studied by every religious instructor.

ON SERMON PREPARATION: Recollections and Suggestions. By the Bishop of Ripon, the Dean of Norwich, the Dean of Canterbury, Archdeacon Sinclair, Canon Tristram, Prebendary Webb-Peploe, the Rev. H. C. G. Moule, the Rev. F. J. Chavarre, the Rev. W. H. M. H. Aitken, the Rev. A. J. Harrison, the Rev. H. Sutton and the Rev. S. R. Buckland. New York, Macmillan & Co., 66 Fifth Avenue. 1896. Price, \$1.00.

This volume consists of an introductory paper and of eleven articles which were originally published in the columns of the *Record*. The authors of these articles, who are all distinguished preachers of the Church of England, were in each case invited to explain their own method of Sermon Preparation. This they did in the different papers here bound together, and the result is a very interesting and instructive book. Students for the ministry can scarcely fail to be benefited by reading it and making a study of each paper. Those already in the ministry will also find it deserving of their attention. It is always entertaining and profitable to be told by eminent men how they have achieved success in their particular calling.

THE ART OF READING AND SPEAKING. By James Fleming, B. D., Vicar of St. Michael's, Chester Square; Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen. Edward Arnold, London, 37 Bedford Street; New York, 70 Fifth Avenue. Price, \$1.00.

It is a very desirable thing to be a good reader and speaker. To become such, however, requires knowledge and practice. To furnish the necessary knowledge, and thus prepare the way for

successful practice, is the purpose of the present volume. And this it does in an admirable and a satisfactory manner. The work is not a professional manual of elocution, but, what is much better, a practical guide for self-culture by one who himself is a cultured and efficient reader and speaker. In his book he only offers the experience of more than thirty years spent in learning for himself the art of which he treats. On the very threshold of his subject he protests with all his might against "the tricks and quackery of elocution." To teach these he claims "would be to offer nostrums, not cures." What he wishes to do is "to make none artificial or stilted, but to help all to be natural and real." Hence his work can scarcely fail to be of real service to those who follow its instructions. It is a truly valuable work, and we heartily commend it to the attention of all our readers.

THE STUDENT'S LIFE OF JESUS: By George Holley Gilbert, Ph. D., D. D., Iowa Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in Chicago Theological Seminary. Press of the Theological Seminary, Chicago. 1896. Price \$1.50.

This *Life of Jesus* differs from the great majority of works on the same subject that have been published during the present century in that it has been prepared to meet especially the wants of students. It does not seek to discuss in detail the teachings of Jesus, or to set forth the devotional lessons that may be drawn from His life, but only to acquaint the reader with the facts thereof as directly and clearly as possible. It is accordingly compact and predominantly critical in character. It begins with an introduction which treats of the sources of the life of Jesus. This is then followed by seventeen chapters relating to the various events of Jesus' life, the first chapter being devoted to the consideration of the Supernatural Conception, and the last to that of the Resurrection and the Risen Christ. The work throughout is highly instructive and interesting, and fully up to the times in scholarship and critical knowledge. The author in his preface very truly says: "A believer in Christianity may investigate the life of Jesus as scientifically as an unbeliever. One fact, among others, which justifies this conviction, and which is sometimes overlooked, is this, that for the Christian, the risen and reigning Lord, who is actually conquering the world, is infinitely greater than the written gospel. The power of Christianity is His spiritual presence, not the inspiration or infallibility of the story of His earthly life. Our faith does not stand or fall with these things. The essential claims for the gospel are daily established by the deepest experience of millions of souls. So the Christian, whose life rests not upon any alleged quality of the gospel, nor even

on the written gospel itself, but whose life consists rather in a personal relation to the living Lord, is, to say the least, as well able to investigate the documents of Christianity impartially as is the unbeliever." Such investigation we have in the volume before us.

THE MAKING OF PENNSYLVANIA: An Analysis of the Elements of the Population and the Formative Influence that Created One of the Greatest of the American States. By Sydney George Fisher, B. A. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company. 1896. Price, \$1.25.

This is a highly interesting and readable volume. In a graphic and entertaining manner it describes the different elements of the population that entered into the making of Pennsylvania, and the influence which they respectively exerted in forming the character of the State. The book is divided into eleven chapters. Of these the first eight treat of the different classes of persons who originally settled the State and whose descendants still make up the larger part of its population. The account which is given of these different classes is notable because of its general fairness and substantial correctness, although not entirely free from errors. The three concluding chapters treat of the early development of science and the mechanic arts within the bounds of the State, the Connecticut invasion and the boundary disputes with Maryland and Virginia. They call attention to some things which will be new to not a few persons. The book should have a wide circulation, especially in the State whose making it portrays.

